

# The Classical Review

JULY 1900.

THE first simultaneous appearance in this journal of brief reports of meetings of the Oxford and Cambridge Philological Societies suggests that some account of the sister societies may interest readers of the *Classical Review*. For the following notice of the elder society, as it would appear to be, we are indebted to its Honorary Secretary, Mr. J. L. Myres, of Christ Church.

'The Oxford Philological Society was formed in 1870 'for the purpose of mutual help in the study of the Greek and Latin language and literature,' and usually meets two or three times a term in the evening for the discussion of papers. Provision has always been made for the discussion of philological papers 'not immediately concerned with Greek or Latin;' and since the decease of the Ancient History Society, a number of papers have been presented dealing with historical and archaeological subjects. The membership has fluctuated between fifty and one hundred; and the first and only President is the present Provost of Oriel. From 1879 to 1890 the Society published annual Transactions in demy 8vo. form, containing the abstracts, and in some cases the full text, of the papers which were read before the Society. The first number contains also the titles of the papers which had been already read before the Society since its foundation, and a reference to those which are published elsewhere in full.

'By a resolution carried in January 1900, there will in future be *six* meetings in the Michaelmas and Lent terms; of which two will be devoted exclusively to philological and literary papers, two to papers on ancient philosophy; and two to papers on ancient history and archaeology.'

NO. CXXV. VOL. XIV.

The published records of the Cambridge Society begin abruptly with the mention of a meeting on February 23, 1872 when, Professor Cowell being President, a Council was elected, and Mr. Jebb (now Professor of Greek) retired from the office of Secretary. It appears to have been an enlargement of a smaller society which met for the purpose of discussing philological, that is to say etymological questions. It is not limited to Cambridge men, it admits ladies to membership, and consists largely of non-residents. It publishes both Proceedings annually, and Transactions from time to time; and as it takes a copy of the *Journal of Philology* for each of its ordinary members, who number about 140, it must rank as the most important supporter of that publication. It possesses a small library, consisting chiefly of periodicals and books acquired by exchange. The Presidency is now practically a biennial office. Its present holder is Dr. C. Taylor, Master of St. John's College; and the Secretaries are Mr. J. A. Nairn, Trinity, and Mr. H. M. Chadwick, Clare.

The proposals of the Cambridge Board of Classics for the improvement of the first part of the Classical Tripos were adopted, not unanimously indeed, but without serious opposition. Their effect for good or ill cannot however be seen for some time as detailed regulations will have to be framed and due notice given of the changes.

We regret that by an oversight in the notice of Dr. P. Shorey's Odes and Epodes of Horace, the editor was taken to task for the phrase 'the blushing Hippocrene,' instead of the prime offender, John Keats.

U

THE TEXT OF THE *ILIAD*—II.

In a previous paper (March 1899) I endeavoured to show that the existing MSS. of the *Iliad* constitute a vulgate, with two exceptions, the Ptolemaic fragments of papyrus and one minuscule family, *h*. The place that the Ptolemaic fragments hold in Homeric tradition is still a mystery,<sup>1</sup> and is likely to remain so, until Teptunis or some yet more fertile site enlighten us. I proceed in this article to elucidate the mediaeval family *h*.

The peculiarity of this family is that, compared to any other group of MSS., it is overwhelmingly Aristarchean. This fact, and its importance, were first brought out by Dr. Leaf, *Journal of Philology* xviii. p.

181 sq. While the other Homeric MSS. certainly have the same origin, whatever it be, these characteristics of *h* suggest that it may be an exception to the vulgate, and really represent some distinct current of descent. Whether this expectation is justified will I think appear from the figures that follow. I have for convenience sake dealt only with the Italian MSS. of the family, viz., M 1, 12, Vat 3, 6, 19, 23, Ven. 2, 4, and I have not been over-careful in determining the archetype, but whenever an ancient reading appears in one member, I have taken that as the reading of the family. For the purpose of this paper it was well to give *h* every advantage.

	A	B	Γ	Δ	E	Z	H	Θ	I	K	Λ	M	N	Ξ	Ο	Π	Ρ	Σ	T	Τ	Φ	Χ	Ψ	Ω
Peculiar readings	0	8	3	7	5	4	9	9	10	10	13	12	11	15	7	14	12	9	4	9	16	10	9	15
Aristarchus ...				3	3	1	3	3	6	3	3	3	2	5			2	1	1	2	2			1
Aristophanes ...							1				1			1		1	1	1			1			
Zenodotus ...																	1	1						
Ancient (non-Ar.)	1	1					1				2	2	1				4		1	2	3		1	
No anc. authority	7	2	4	2	3	4	6	4	7	9	7	7	8	7	13	4	7	2	5	10	10	8	14	

## TOTALS.

Peculiar readings ...	221
Aristarchus ...	44
Aristophanes ...	7
Zenodotus ...	1
Ancient (non-Ar.) ...	19
No ancient authority ...	150

Expressed in percentages, of every 100 peculiar readings in *h*, 20 are Aristarchean, 12 are ancient but non-Aristarchean, and the remainder, 68, have no known source.

What conclusion upon the origin of the family do these figures indicate? Two hypotheses naturally present themselves:

<sup>1</sup> The fragments published by Professors Mahaffy and Nicole contain no clue to any ancient connection; the Geneva MS. on A 814, 822 has coincidences with mediaeval MSS. and (822) with an *ἐν ἑλλὰς* of Ven. A, but nothing further can be inferred. Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt's pieces have two superscribed variants at Φ 397, 398, one of which, *ὑποδόσφιον*, is known to be Antimachus' reading, the other (*ἐμὲ* for *δὲ*) may belong to Antimachus also. If these variants, as is most probable, were added out of curiosity, then at all events we know that the edition to which the fragments belong is not that of Antimachus: it is less likely, but still conceivable, that they are intended as real corrections of actual errors of the scribe. Then the edition would be that of Antimachus. The other peculiarities lead nowhither.

There is, of course, a strong likeness between all these fragments and the copies used by Aeschines, Plato (in the *II. Alcibiades*), and Plutarch. Unfortunately these variants also are all but isolated and

the family may be either a recension, or a survival more or less direct of an ancient edition. The former is the suggestion which *prima facie* most commends itself: we are familiar with attempts upon the Homeric text for at least six centuries, and there would seem nothing to hinder the view that towards the decline of the ancient world, about the period when the *Viermänner-commentar* was reduced to scholia, and when so many Latin authors underwent revision, a grammarian should have improved the common text by the fruits of his reading.

Natural as the view is, it seems at once set aside by the results given above. A

connect with no known ancient source. One possibility has not been noticed. One of the passages in which Aeschines' copy departs from the common text is Ψ 77 sq. His substantial differences—the addition of 81a, 83a b, and the new versions of 82 and 84 are nowhere else alluded to, but his verbal variant in 77, *οὐ γὰρ ἔτι* for *οὐ μὲν γὰρ* is quoted by schol. A as *ἐν τισι τῶν πολιτικῶν*. It is possible, considering how defective our knowledge of the *πολιτικά* is, that the additions also may have come from the same copy—one of the *κατὰ πόλεις*. (Aeschines also appears to omit 92, a verse athetised by Aristarchus, and of which we are told *οὐκ ἦν ἐν πάσαις*.) It is perhaps not too much to assume that Aeschines' quotations are made from the same book. (Plato also, *Ion* 538 D, reads *πῆμα* in Ω 82, with *ἔναι τῶν κατὰ πόλεις*.)

Given therefore the general resemblance in character between the papyrus-variants and the quotations there is this faint connection between the Ptolemaic papyri and the *πολιτικά*.

certain amount of eclecticism may be allowed to a commentator, but it is too much to suppose that any Graeculus could have made so eccentric a choice of readings as results from this table: not only are the readings chosen without regard to their intrinsic merit (the consideration of *merit* as such is foreign to my plan, but any one who includes that side of the question will find that survival is in no sense dependent on it), but the supposititious editor leaps at will from Aristarchus to his adversaries, and in one book and another ignores both. Nothing can be more evident than the absence of plan or intention from *h*.

If the family is not a recension, is it the descendant of an original ancient, probably prae-Aristarchean edition? This certainly daring view has met with the qualified approval of Dr. Leaf (*l.c.* p. 204). We are however met with (1) the difficulties of the readings offered by *h* that are given above: the motley, inconsistent and arbitrary selection of the lections themselves. An 'edition' which was *ex hypothesi* the source of these readings would be a marvel. (2) We actually know a considerable number of prae-Aristarchean editions, the πολιτικά, the κατ' ἀνδρα, etc. The coincidences between these and *h* are negligible. (3) That there were other texts in existence before Aristarchus besides these appears clearly from the Ptolemaic fragments: but these fragments stand in no relation to *h*. Their characteristic is the omission or addition of lines: *h* deals very slightly in this sort of variant. Its peculiarities are verbal. (4) We have to add the great improbability of an edition, unmentioned in our scholia, and at least prae-Christian, propagating itself in obscurity and emerging in three or four copies in the 13th century. The catena of papyri is now fairly continuous and becomes every day stronger. No mediaeval family, at all, one may say roughly, is continued backwards by them: but no papyrus, Ptolemaic, Roman, or Byzantine, has yet been found which bears the faintest relation to *h*. Its disappearance and emergence would be an unparalleled literary katavothra. (5) Lastly, as against both the recension and the survival theory, we must set the extreme imperfec-

tion of the Aristarchean tradition offered by the family. Compared with any single family, the proportion of Aristarchean readings peculiar to *h* no doubt is large (*e* 3, *f* 4, *g* 2, *h* 44); but in relation to the total recorded number of Aristarchus' lections (664), or even the total number of those which have found a place in MSS. whether few or many (495), such a total of peculiarities is trifling; and suggests that the phenomenon does not stand apart, but is only a slightly special case of the conditions under which Aristarchean readings have survived generally.

The nature of the peculiarities of *h*—that the ancient readings vary in number from book to book (Aristarchean readings being entirely absent from A, B, Γ, O, II, X, Ψ), belong to different and contrary sources, and in all cases are merely a tithe of what we know from other authorities to have existed, seems to require an origin which shall not involve purpose, but which shall provide for the free working of chance. I can think of no other than the adscription and absorption of marginal readings. This process takes us into the region of semi-conscious graphical phenomena, in which the incalculable and the casual is the rule. I suppose the ancestor of *h*, a MS. of some not very ancient period, certainly Byzantine, to have exhibited a vulgate text with a copious selection of variants in the margin, variants not chosen as proceeding from one or another critic, but as alternatives to the text. Successive copyists allowed their eye to be caught now by one now by another of these marginalia and transferred them to the book in hand. Result, the fine sprinkling of Aristarchean, anti-Aristarchean and merely ancient readings which we see.

I will not develop this suggestion further at present: but I would point out that it implies a process which is independent or almost independent of design, operates in the case of all authors without exception, is the cause of most textual variation, and involves the minimum of presupposition. It explains I think the characteristics of this family, and has an even wider application.

T. W. ALLEN.

## A NEW SYSTEM OF ANALYSING GREEK LYRIC STANZAS.

GREEK Lyric poetry permits the formulation of so few rules which do not present unimpeachable exceptions that Westphal's temerity in asserting that the internal structure of stanzas *must present symmetry* is at once apparent. He ought not to have ventured further than 'the internal structure of stanzas very often presents symmetry.' No unbiassed analyser could find internal symmetry in the Epode of Pindar *Nem.* 8; while J. H. H. Schmidt's analysis, *Ol.* 7, Strophe, of six verses into six periods is enough to discredit his method at once.

It is obviously safer and more scientific not to propound dogmatic rules, but to note the comparative rarity or frequency of various forms and methods, and to expect exceptions to be discovered even if we do not know of any. Surely it was a surprise to find syncopated feet corresponding to unsyncopated feet (*vv.* 11, 26) in Bacchylides V. 51, 66, 91, 106, etc.

The analysis of true choral odes is mainly concerned with the division of such stanzas as exhibit symmetry of internal structure into kôla, or rhythmical sentences, arranged so as to form not only verses but also symmetrical periods in which corresponding or equated kôla contain an equal number of feet and frequently also present similar characteristics.

Sometimes, however, symmetrically equated kôla present contrast instead of similarity as to the character of the component feet, e.g., Soph. *Trach.* 893f. = ἔτεκεν ἔτεκε δὴ μεγάλην = ἃ νεόρτος ἄδε νύμφα. Soph. *Oed. R.* 172, 177 (dactylic), κλυτὰς χθονὸς αὔξεται οὔτε τόκοισιν = ἀκτὰν πρὸς ἐσπέρου θεοῦ (epitritic) cf. *Trach.* 1004f.

Noticeable is the frequent equation of a choreic verse having anacrusis with a logaoedic verse without anacrusis—e.g., Soph. *Oed. Col.* 186 τέτροφεν ἄφρον ἀποστνγῆν, of which case of anacrusis Schmidt offers no explanation. That this frequent form of correspondence must not tempt us to formulate a general rule is shown by Soph. *Trach.* 893f. cited above.

When two or more kôla or verses are equated with the same number of kôla or verses in a period there is sometimes an inversion of characteristics;—e.g. if *vv.* 1, 2, 3 = *vv.* 7, 8, 9 of a period, *vv.* 1, 3 and 8 only may have anacrusis, or *vv.* 2, 7, 9 may be acatalectic, the others being catalectic,

or be logaoedic the rest being choreic. The Parodos of the *Antigone* offers a good case of inversion: where two second glyconics, one second glyconic, and one third glyconic are answered by two third glyconics, one third glyconic and one second glyconic.

The two forms of contrast in correspondence which have just been mentioned, viz. contrast of choreic preceded by anacrusis with logaoedic without anacrusis, and inversion of various kinds, furnish the key to the analysis of many stanzas, and the observation of them has contributed to the evolution of the system which is here indicated.

It is abundantly clear that periodology or kôlometry can not be regarded as an exact science; but whenever the analyst, in presence of an alternative, chooses the less usual rather than the more usual, or makes assumptions, he must in each individual case put forward reasons for so doing and must endeavour to take into account every distinctive feature of the stanza and its component elements. Hitherto analysts have failed in these particulars more or less as compared with the present treatment of the subject, and have counted feet in too off-hand and arbitrary a manner. By counting, combined with arbitrary assumptions of syncope and pause, it is sometimes possible to produce two or more analyses between which there is little to choose. This at once recommends a system which restrains freedom of choice. Several important limitations are imposed by the system embodied in the following statements which I claim to have proved by examination of all extant melic Greek verse and all the true choral odes of Greek tragedy—not to mention kommoi and lyrics for actors to which some of the statements do not so generally apply.

(1) A stanza (strophe or epode) generally consists of one or two periods only.<sup>1</sup>

(2) The end of a period generally coincides quite or nearly with a pause or break in the sense.

(3) In the most usual case of two

<sup>1</sup> Pindar has a few stanzas made up of three symmetrical periods and a few unsymmetrical stanzas in which division into periods cannot be determined with any approach to certainty. In Pindar's *Olympian Odes* instead of J. H. H. Schmidt's 94 periods I find only 27.



constituent periods to a stanza which is not a single period, the number of feet in the two periods often present a simple ratio, e.g.  $\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\frac{1}{3}$  or  $\frac{2}{3}$ ,  $\frac{3}{4}$  or  $\frac{4}{5}$  or  $\frac{5}{6}$  etc.,  $\frac{1}{3}$  or  $\frac{2}{3}$ ,  $\frac{3}{5}$  or  $\frac{4}{5}$ ,  $\frac{2}{5}$  or  $\frac{3}{5}$ , etc.,  $\frac{1}{4}$  or  $\frac{3}{4}$ ,  $\frac{1}{5}$  or  $\frac{2}{5}$  etc. etc.

(4) Symmetrical periods can sometimes be divided into sections or into symmetrical hypo-periods.

(5) The incidence of anacrusis must be carefully considered.

(6) The evidence of *MSS.* must be taken into account, though its value varies and is especially poor as to the division of long verses.

(7) The characteristics of kôla must be carefully considered as well as the number of feet.

(8) The assumption of syncope or pause must be made with reserve and caution, and justified by intelligible reasons besides the production of arithmetical symmetry.

(9) Symmetry in periods or internal symmetry of stanzas is not to be invariably assumed.

(10) A division of verses which places important words, having ictus on an inflexional syllable or no ictus at all, at the beginning or end of a verse is *ceteris paribus* preferable.

(11) The occurrence of inverted correspondence of characteristics is to be observed.

An analysis which falls in with more of the above eleven conditions than other

analyses is to be preferred as most likely to interpret the poet's structure of the stanza.

I agree with Westphal and Moris Schmidt in disregarding equality or uniformity in the distribution of corresponding kôla into verses, respect for which seems to be one reason why J. H. H. Schmidt sometimes divides up a stanza into so many periods. I proceed however, on totally distinct lines. M. Schmidt for example in the Strophe of Pindar *Nem.* 1 equates five verses with two, thus ignoring an excess of at least one verse-pause. Those who hold that verses often end in the middle of a word, cannot object to my analysis on this score.

Examples of my treatment of verse-division are Pindar *Ol.* 9, Strophe, where a verse 43 is equated with two verses 4, 3; and in the epode three verses, 4, 4, 2, with one verse, 244. The equation of 3, 35 with 5, 33 in the Strophe is not quite the same, but is a case of *inversion* of the verse-distribution of kôla.

In O. 1, 4, 332, 33=332, 334. In P. 2, 4343=43, 43 and 53=5, 3. In P. 1, 2, 53, 44=443, 52; P. 3, 542=2, 54 and 5, 2=25; P. 7, 23=3, 2; P. 10, 3, 332=3332; P. 11, 42=2, 4; O. 6, 45=54. With equal number of verse-pauses, O. 1, 43, 35=533, 4; O. 10, 42, 42=4, 242.

The following are simple and not exceptionally favourable illustrations of my system.

SOPH. *Trach.* 956-961 AND 965-970

II. (4) a4	str.	τὸν Ζηγνὸς ἀλκιμον γόνον	}
„	antistr.	πᾶ δ' αὖ φορεῖ νιν; ὡς φίλον	
{ (5) a3a	str.	μὴ παρβαλέα θάνοιμι	}
„	antistr.	προκηδομένα. βαρεῖαν	
{ (6) 4	str.	μοῖνον εἰσιδοῖσ' ἄφαρ	}
„	antistr.	ἄψοφον φέρει βάσιν.	
(7) a4	str.	ἐπεὶ ἐν δυσπαλλάκτοις ὁδύνας.	}
„	antistr.	αἰαί, ὅδ' ἀνανδάτος φέρεται.	
{ (8) a3a	str.	χωρεῖν πρὸ δόμων λέγουσιν	}
„	antistr.	τί χρὴ θανόντα νιν ἢ καθ'	
{ (9) 4	str.	ἄσπετόν τι θαῦμα.	}
„	antistr.	ἔπινον ὄντα κρῖναι;	

The Arabic numbers indicate the number of feet in a kôlon (which is often also a verse). Anacrusis is denoted by 'a,' catalexis by a. Period II. 4, 3, 4, 4, 3, 4=22. Palindodic with prelude and mesode (v. 7). The tripodies and mesode (Third Glyconic) are logaoedic, the rest choreic. As Period

I. has 16 feet, I should like Period II. to have 24 feet, but I dare not assume catalexis in v. 5 and v. 8.

As v. 8 in the antistrophe is a First Pherecratic, *θάναν* (Bothe) should perhaps be read for *θανόντα* which may be due to *δντα* in the next verse.

SOPH. O.C. 668 FF.

- |      |          |                              |
|------|----------|------------------------------|
| (1)  | 4a       | εὐίππου, ξένη, τῷδε χώρας    |
| (2)  | a4a      | ἴκον τὰ κράτιστα γὰς ἐπαυλα, |
| (3)  | a4       | τον ἀργῆτα Κολωνόν, ἐνθ'     |
| (4)  | 4        | ἀ λῆγεια μινύρεται           |
| (5)  | a4a      | θαμίζονσα μάλιστ' ἀγδών      |
| (6)  | a3       | χλωραῖς ὑπὸ βάσσαις,         |
| (7)  | a4a      | τὸν οἰνωπὸν ἔχονσα κισσὸν    |
| (8)  | a3       | καὶ τὰν ἄβατον θεοῦ          |
| (9)  | 4a       | φυλλάδα μυριόκαρπον ἀνήλιον  |
| (10) | a4 chor. | ἀνήμερόν τε πάντων           |
| (11) | a4a      | χειμώνων ἦν ὁ βακχιώτας      |
| (12) | a4a      | αἰεὶ Διόνυσος ἐμβατεύει      |
| (13) | 4a       | θεαῖς ἀμφιπολὼν τιθήναις.    |

Logaedic except v. 10. Mesodic.

Vv. 1, 13 are Second Glyconics, similar except that *θεαῖς* is a syncopated foot; vv. 2, 12 are similar First Glyconics; vv. 3, 11 are Second Glyconics with syncope of the first foot, similar except that v. 3 is catalectic; vv. 4, 10 present the contrast of a logaedic verse without anacrusis and a choreic verse with anacrusis and with syncope of the third foot; vv. 5, 9 present a somewhat analogous contrast, and the first foot of v. 5 is syncopated; vv. 6, 8 are catalectic First Pherecratics, the second foot of v. 6 being syncopated; v. 7, the mesode, is a Second Glyconic.

Observe that vv. 3 and 11 contain the transition from Colonus to the nightingale and her bower and therefrom to Bacchus respectively, while the mesode gives the first Bacchic note. Professor Jebb does not print in his text J. H. H.

Schmidt's six long verses with a tetrapodic epode which are not even justified by the MSS. placing αἰεὶ in v. 11 thus making a hexapody with a corresponding error in the antistrophe, as Schmidt ends his *kôlon* after the third syllable of *βακχιώτας*. His solitary choreic tetrapody *ιον ἀνήμερόν τε πάντων* with a solitary instance of acatalexy is taken as a matter of course. The 'falling rhythm' which Schmidt assumes is not appropriate to this chorus. The MSS. version of v. 11 seems due to equating *Διόνυσος ἐμβατεύει* with *ἀνήμερόν τε πάντων*. It is fair to say that according to the MSS. Vv. 1-7 and 8-13 might possibly be two mesodic periods, v. 8 being a prelude and perhaps a tetrapody with initial syncope, as v. 6 would necessarily be. I prefer to reject the MS. hexapody for v. 11.

SOPH. Phil. 676 FF.

- |      |        |  |
|------|--------|--|
| (1)  | I. a6  | λόγῳ μὲν ἐξήκουσ' ὄπωπα δ' οὐ μάλα                           |
| (2)  | 5      | τὸν πελάταν λέκτρων ποτὲ τῶν Διὸς                            |
| (3)  | a5, 3a | κατὰ δρομάδ' ἀμπυκα δέσμιον ὡς ἐβαλεν παγκρατῆς Κρόνου παῖς. |
| (4)  | a3, 5  | ἄλλον δ' οὔτιν' ἔγωγ' οἶδα κλύων οὐδ' ἐσιδὼν μοῖρα           |
| (5)  | 5a     | τοῦδ' ἐχθίονι συντυχόντα θνατῶν                              |
| (6)  | a6     | ὅς οὔτ' ἐρξας τιν' οὔτε νοσφίσας,                            |
| (7)  | 4      | ἀλλ' ἴσος ὦν ἴσοις ἀνὴρ,                                     |
| (8)  | II. 4  | ὦλθ' ὦδ' ἀναξίως.  |
| (9)  | a2a    | τόδε θαῦμ' ἔχει με   |
| (10) | 5      | πῶς ποτε, πῶς ποτ' ἀμφιπλάκτων,                              |
| (11) | a3, 5  | ρόθίων μόνος κλύων, πῶς ἄρα πανδάκρυνον οὔτω                 |
| (12) | a2a    | βιοτὰν κατέσχευ;   |

Period I. 6, 5, 53, 35, 5, 6, 4=42. Inverted with epode. Note inversion of acatalexy in vv. 2-5. The syncopes of the first and second feet of v. 6 are effective, as is the falling rhythm produced by syncope before catalexis in vv. 10 11.

The hexapodies are choreic or iambic

verses. Period II. 4, 2, 5, 35, 2=21. Mesodic with prelude. The pentipodies have a dactyl for first foot like Period I. v. 2. In the antistrophe the second foot of v. 9 is resolved and the first irrational. The mesode is an adherent *kôlon*. I follow L except as to dividing v. 3, v. 4, and v. 11,

and avoid equating vv. 7 and 8 which are dissimilar, and the syncopation of inflexional syllables which are penultimate in v. 3 (680, 695). Note the double anacrusis to the mesode and the dipodies.

Considering the symmetry suggested by

L, the discovery of 4 possible First Glyconics in one long verse at the end of the stanza hardly justifies the ignoring of L where comparatively short verses can be presented.

C. A. M. FENNELL.

### TIBULLIANA.<sup>1</sup>

#### I. 5. 65 sq.

pauper ad occultos furtim deducet amicos  
uinclaue de niueo detrahet ipse pede.

In the context of this distich from line 61 onwards Tibullus is describing the attentions which a lover of humble means can render to his mistress. He will be the first to greet her when he meets her abroad, he will keep close by her side in the hustling street (61 sq.). He will elbow her a way through the crowd (63 sq.) and finally he will not shrink from the task of himself removing her walking shoes (66). In the middle of the recital of such humble services comes the verse whose meaning we have to consider, 'the poor man will stealthily take her home to the houses of secret (or unacknowledged) friends.' Whose friends? Hers or his? Male or female? What is the purport of the secrecy so pointedly insisted on? If Tibullus had said 'The rich man will be ashamed of you: he will take you to his friends' houses, it may be, but only secretly, and by stealth; but with the poor man you will go openly,' we should have had an intelligible antithesis. But the text suggests the exact opposite. To the criticism of Baehrens that in itself the line is unintelligible I can find no sufficient reply. But it is hardly less strange in its environment. Do we expect to find among humble and almost menial services which the rich lover cannot or will not render but the lover of modest means can and will, that of taking her to the houses of friends? Granted that he would not walk with her; but would not the lady prefer to drive?

The senseless *amicos* has been long ago condemned, and the corrector of the now discredited Wolfenbüttel codex (Baehrens' G) substituted *amictus*, a change accepted by Statius, by Heyne and by Baehrens, of whom the last named writes 'rara igitur felicitate hic uerum uidit g 'amictus' repo-

nendo.' I agree with these three scholars in welcoming *amictus*, a word which scribes often confuse with *amicus*, and in condemning *occultos*, a condemnation in which, as Baehrens saw, *furtim* also is necessarily involved. But I cannot find any more probability in the latter's reconstitution 'pauper ad hoc cinctos raptim deducet amictus' than its author did in Statius's 'et ex cultos furtim deducet amictus' or in Heyne's 'et excussos furtim deducit amictus'; and I think my three predecessors have, very naturally, misunderstood the meaning of *amictus* here. *amictus* are not the outer garments but the leggings or stockings (*fasciae crurales* or *tibiales*), the *fasciae* 'quibus erura uestiuntur' Quintilian 11. 3. 144 and which every woman who respected her personal appearance must have worn when walking through the muddy streets of Rome. In this connexion I need only quote Propertius 2. 23. 15 'cui saepe immundo Sacra conteritur Via socco' and Juvenal 3. 247 'pinguia crura luto' (with Mayor's note).

Directly this is observed the correction of the line will present little difficulty; *ad occultos* is *adhuc luteos* but thinly disguised. The same confusion of *c* and *e* has turned *aenique* into *cuique* at III. (Lygd.) 4, 47; *furtim* is an attempt which *occultos* very obviously suggested to make something out of *uris* which had lost its first letter through haplography. It is unfortunately true that wanton alteration must be recognized as a cause of corruption in the text of Tibullus. It is not necessary to examine disputed passages. Two instances from the Panegyric where Scaliger has recorded readings from the excellent Cujacian fragment (F), unfortunately now lost, are sufficient to show this. Pan. 2 *nequeant* F, *ualeant* our MSS. 96 *ueniat grauis* F, *grandis uenit* our MSS. The line then will run

pauper *adhuc luteos suris* deducet amictus,  
and its sense will be 'The poor man will

<sup>1</sup> Read before the Cambridge Philological Society on May 31, 1900.

remove from your calves the leggings still plastered with mud.'

## I. 9. 69.

ista persuadet facies auroque lacertos  
uinciat et Tyrio prodeat apta sinu.

This is the reading of the MSS. Strange as it may appear, I cannot find that *ista <ne>* has been proposed; *ne* fell out before *pe*.

## Pan. Messallae 39 sqq.

nam quis te maiora gerit castrispue foroue ?  
nec tamen hic aut hic tibi laus maiorue  
minorue;  
iusta pari premitur veluti cum pondere  
libra,  
prona nec hac plus parte sedet, nec surgit  
ab illa :  
qualis inaequatam si quando onus urget  
utrimque,  
instabilis natat alterno depressor orbe.

The writer of this composition is comparing the equality of his patron's merits in the arts of war and peace to the equality of a perfect balance; and he spends four lines upon the comparison. Line 41, with which he begins his simile presents no difficulty. It regards a balance which is perfectly true and sensitive (this is the full meaning of *iusta*) and which is loaded with equal weights. He might have stopped here; but the enchantment of his notion

carries him on, and he describes at length the behaviour of such a balance. Now every one knows what that is. The scale pans swing up and down alternately, oscillating to the least impulse.

This then is the meaning of 44 '*instabilis natat alterno depressor orbe*'; and it shows that '*inaequatum—onus urget utrimque*' means the same as '*pari premitur—pondere*' and that *inaequatum* does not mean *inaequale*, as the commentators and lexicons say, but *aequatam*, being the participle of the verb used by Caesar, B.C. 1. 27. 4 '*haec leuibus cratibus terraque inaequat*.' Recognizing then that it is the sense of *iusta* which is expanded in the couplet '*qualis—orbe*,' we see that line 41 is out of place and does not belong to the description of the *libra*. It completes the simile and should accordingly be placed after 44, and it is to be understood thus: your merits in camp and forum balance exactly, neither turning the scale; thus when a true balance is loaded with equal weights, we see the scale pans swinging up and down alternately, the fall and rise of both being exactly equal.

In the two following places the manuscript reading should be restored. II. 6. 49 *leg.* '*mihi promissa est*.' And in IV. 6. 15 '*praecipit et natae mater studiosa quod optet*' a comma being placed at the end of 14.

J. P. POSTGATE.

## PROLEGOMENA IN M. MANILII ASTRONOMICA.

Cum Astronomicum poeta a nemine ueterum scriptorum commemoratus sit,—neque enim *uss.* I. 692 ad 694, quos scriba codicis Lipsiensis '*Priscianum in exemplum ducere*' in margine adnotat, apud eum leguntur—nomen eius e codicum testimoniis eruatur necesse est. Qua in re male accidit, quod membranarum uetustissimarum, nimirum Gemblacensis saec. X. uel XI. et Lipsiensis saec. XI., tituli genuini coloris rubri rasura deleti, subscriptiones autem, quae poetae nomen contineant, his in codicibus omnino omissae sunt. Quae libri Gemblacensis rasura eo damnosior est, quo diligentius scribam eius ut totum carmen, ita inscriptionem quoque exarauisse ueri est simile, cum titulum Prisciani carminis in eodem uolumine ab eodem descripti plenissimum hunc exhibeat:

INCIPIT PERIEGESIS PRISCIANI GRAMMATICI  
et in fine carminis :

FELICITER EXPLICIT PERIEGESIS ID EST  
DESCRIPTIO ORBIS TERRARVM ET MARIS  
PRISCIANI GRAMMATICI SECVNDVM  
D I O N I S I V M

Nunc Gemblacensis a manu saec. XV. prae se fert hanc inscriptionem: *Malius poeta*, contra Lipsiensis, quocum Cusanus et Vossianus 1 consentiunt:

ARATI. PHILOSOPHI. ASTRONOMICON.  
LIBER. PRIMVS. INCIPIT. PRELIBATIO.

Haec falsa poetae appellatio aut inde nata est, quod in illo libro, unde Lipsiensis eiusque affines manauerunt, ante hoc carmen Aratei quoque carminis uersio aliqua Latina inerat, aut quod scriba similitudine rerum ab utro-

1 C  
Frid.  
Disco  
(1899  
2 C  
Sylve  
1867

que poeta descriptorum perductus nomine genuino in archetypo omissio nomen astrologi notissimi de suo praefixit. Manu tamen recentiore inductis *Arati philosophi* uocibus in Lipsiensi et Vossiano l supra scriptum est: *Marci Manilii*. Ac primum quidem in *praenomine* Marco omnes nostri libri manu scripti consentiunt, qui omnino praenomen exhibent. Unus Casinensis deperditus Laurentio Bonincontrio teste *Gai* praenomen in fronte habebat; cui tamen codici ne nimiam tribuamus auctoritatem, sectiones ex ipso prolatae admonent, bonitatem nostrorum librorum superioris classis minime aequantes.

Deinde *gentilicii* nominis tres formae sollemni illa uarietate confusae in libris exstant: *Manilius*, *Manlius*, *Mallius*; quae forma eligenda sit, statim patebit. Etenim non solum illud uetustum exemplar a Poggio in monasterio Sangallensi inuentum, in quo praeter huius poetae *Astronomica* etiam 'Q. Asconii Pediani fragmentum cum parte C. Valerii Flacci balbi setini Argonauticon et Statii Silvarum libri' inerant,<sup>1</sup> sed etiam ueterrimus ille codex, qui ut sibi describatur Gerbertus<sup>2</sup> a Rainardo monacho in epistula (cxix.) 78 petit, *Marci Manilii* nomine insignitus erat. Decimo igitur saeculo exeunte, quo *Astronomica* huius poetae ab obliuione uindicata et denuo legi uidentur coepta esse, carmen illud sub Marci Manilii nomine in bibliothecis condebatur; qua in appellatione quoad fontes melioris notae detecti erunt acquiescendum censeo. Neque uero ullius est momenti illa adnotatio ad Cusani codicis titulum a recentiore manu adscripta: 'hic liber non potest antiqui arati esse qui fuit tempore antgoni et machabeorum ut patet hic ex septimo uersu quia auctor fuit tempore augusti. sed fuit marcellus.'—Neque magis premendum est *Boeci cognomen* codicis Urbin. 668 aliis in libris in *Boeni* uel *Poeni* formas deprauatum. Quam uocem qui primus nomini poetae ignoti addidit, meminerat fortasse Anicii *Manlii* Seuerini *Boetii* philosophi etiam astronomiae studiosi.

*Antiochi* denique agnomen in Vossiani deperditi inscriptionem ex eis Plinii Nat. Hist. xxxv. 199 uerbis irrepsit (unde nomen Manilii suppositiciu in codices Astronomicon omniu nigrasse et Bentleius et

Otto Ribbeck opinantur), quibus Manilius Antiochus astrologiae conditor inter alios uenales una cum Staberio Erote Romam naue aduectus esse narratur. Attamen hunc Plinii Manilium ne quis Bonincontrium secutus, qui poetam ab Antiochenis oriundum facit, pro eodem habeat atque Astronomicon poetam, uel temporum rationes impediunt. Staberium enim Eroteum Bruti et Cassii fuisse magistrum Sullanisque temporibus proscriptorum liberos gratis in disciplinam recepisse Suetonius de gramm. 13 narrat. Atqui Astronomicon conditor post cladem Varianam scribens nondum senex erat precans:

i. 114

faueat magno Fortuna labori,  
annosa et molli contingat uita senecta,  
ut possim rerum tantas emergere moles.

Hanc temporum repugnantiam ut tollat Carolus Mueller, Geogr. Gr. min. ii. p. xvii. hunc poetam ab illo Manilio seruo genus duxisse suspicatur. Neque huc facit ille mathematicus, qui teste Plinio Nat. Hist. xxxvi. 72 ab Augusto iussus in campo Martio ad deprendendas solis umbras diurnae ac nocturnae magnitudines apici auram pilam addidit; in optimo enim codice ille mathematicus Nouius, in deterioribus libris Manilius uel Manlius nominatur.

*Peregrinum* eum fuisse Lilius Gyraldus in quarto de poetarum historia dialogo docet inquinato, quod ei uidetur, poetae genere loquendi offensus. Carthaginiensis uidebatur esse Huetio; Bentleio fortasse ex Asia peregrinus, concludenti peregrinitatem cum e singulari eius quorundam uerborum constructione, tum inde, quod Romani adeo mature arti siderali operam non dederint. Pro Poeno etiam Fridericus Jacob (Progr. Luebec. 1832, p. 14 sqq.) eum habet nisus potissimum in titulo illo Vossiani 1, in orationis quadam ubertate, in praepositionum usu, quem dicit, laxiore, in particularum aliqua paupertate, in uerbis eisdem ad fastidium repetitis, in rebus denique Africae studiosius commemoratis.—Singulari esse Manilii genus dicendi, modo aenigmatum subtilitate obscurum, modo diffuens nimia uerbositate, nunc exile et aridum, nunc tumidum uerborumque iteratione molestissimum nec raro colore poetico destitutum haud negauerim, ut mirum non sit, inueniri, qui eum poetae nomine indignum esse iudicent. Sed consideres, quaeso, asperitatem ne dicam ieiunitatem materiae, quam ille uersibus persequendam sibi proposuit a laetis uerae poesis pratis toto caelo di-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Mauricius Krohn in praef. Stat. Silu. ed. Frid. Vollmer, p. 39, et A. C. Clark, 'The Literary Discoveries of Poggio' in the *Classical Review*, xiii. (1899), p. 119 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Oeuvres de Gerbert Pape* sous le nom de Sylvestre II, par A. Olleris, Clermont et Paris, 1867 p. 45 et préface p. li.



stantem, id quod poeta ipse sentit, cum monet :

iii. 38

nec dulcia carmina quaeras.

ornari res ipsa negat contenta doceri.

Idem tamen cum in amoeniores intrat campos,—prooemia maxime dico et digressiones, e quibus Ariadnae fabula Ovidianis coloribus splendens egregie perlucet, variorumque sub singulis sideribus morum ac studiorum descriptiones—et ingenium et sermonem declarat uere poeticum. Itaque non omni ex parte Scaligeri nimiam Manilii aestimationem probo eum Ouidio suauitate parem, maiestate superiorem esse existimantis atque ingeniosissimum nitidissimumque appellantis scriptorem, in quo excepta illa uitiosa uerborum iteratione nihil ad perfectionem absoluti operis requiratur. Suus igitur esse Manilius in loquendo nobis quoque uidetur, barbarus non item.—Huc accedit obseruantia legum metricarum Manilii diligentissima, quae una res de homine peregrino cogitari uetat.

Ad alterum autem Bentlei argumentum infringendum, quod nititur in Romanorum illius aetatis rerum caelestium inscitia, C. Sulpicii Galli, M. Terentii Varronis Reatini, P. Nigidii Figuli studia astrologica attulisse sufficiat. Immo ex ipsius poetae uerbis elucet ei Romanorum scriptorum libros artis astronomicae pedestri quidem sermone conscriptos haud ignotos fuisse, cum de suo carmine dicit :

i. 113

hoc mihi surgit opus non ullis ante sacratum carminibus,

unde simul id apparet, cum Manilius haec scriberet, Germanici Arateorum Phaenomenon uersionem nondum esse editam.

Sed ipsum poetam audiamus Romanam suam originem apertis uerbis profitentem. Duodecim enim caeli stationum uires et effectus describens de undecima, quam felicem appellat, poeta haec addit :

ii. 888

cui titulus felix, censum sic proxima Graiae nostra subit linguae uertitque a nomine nomen

i.e. sic nostra Latina lingua ad notionem linguae Graecae proxime accedit.

Neque minoris momenti est alter locus, quo idem ineuitabilem fati necessitatem etiam in ea re cernit, quod post praeclaras illas Hannibalis ad Trasimenum et ad Cannas uictorias tamen Carthago perierit, et uictor Poenus a Romanorum catenis ex-

spectatus tandem ei mortis succubuerit, quam ut noxius et fugitiuus promeruisset; quid referam, inquit,

iv. 40

accepisse iugum uictae Carthaginis arces? speratum Hannibalem nostris cecidisse catenis  
exiliumque rei furtiua morte luisse?

Quorum locorum Bentleius neque illum silentio transire neque hunc ut barbarum delere debuit, quod uersibus 40–42 eiectis totius sententiae acumen corrumpit. Iacobum autem miror illos uersus Manilianos esse iudicantem nihilo setius poetae peregrinitatem imponere.

Quibus tamen in uerbis si quis ullam persuadendi uim inesse negauerit, quippe cum quilibet homo peregrinus, speciem cuius Romani ut indueret, sic loqui potuerit, audias uelim dictionem poetae animum hominis uere Romani spirantem. Hinc iusta eius admiratio magnitudinis imperii Romani e minimis initiis ad summum rerum fastigium adaucti; hinc tanta eius rerum Romanarum aestimatio, ut rei publicae Romanae fortunam eandem esse praedicet atque caeli fortunam; hinc crebrae eius laudes Romanorum uirorum fortium; hinc praeferuida eius in Germanos ira; hinc denique singularis eius atque recondita rerum Romanarum et ad publicam et ad priuatam uitam pertinentium scientia multiplex, speciosior illa quidem, quam ut homini peregrino tribui possit.

Sequitur quaestio difficillima: qua aetate Manilius floruerit uel potius, quo annorum spatio carmen suum composuisse et utri principi, Octauiano Augusto an Tiberio, dedicasse existimandus sit. Atque in tres potissimum sententias uiri docti discesserunt. Namque Geuartii quominus assentiatur opinioni falsissimae, quamuis aliquamdiu etiam G. I. Vossio probatae: Theodosianis poetam uixisse temporibus eundemque esse atque Flauium Manlium Theodorum ob sideralem scientiam a Claudiano xvii. 100 sqq. 253 laudatum, uel ars metrica Manilii impedit cf. supra dicta.

Iosepho igitur Scaligero et Richardo Bentleio Octauianus Augustus electus carminis patronus uidetur esse, cui opinioni felicissime Augustus Kraemer suffragatus est. Neque aliter Rudolphus Merkel cogitasse uidetur Astronomicon poetam sub Ibidis nomine latere ratus.

Contra Carolus Lachmann Augusto demum mortuo opus a poeta et inceptum et confectum esse ut sibi, ita etiam Bertholdo Freiero et Ribbeckio et Schanzio atque

nuperrime Felici Ramorino persuasit; quorum Freier ullum Astronomicum esse uersum negans, ex quo pateat Augustum poeta scribente inter uiuos fuisse, Manilium, quem una cum Germanico in Asia peregrinantem facit, carmen intra annos p. Chr. n. 17 et 22 partim Romae partim in Asia scripsisse comprobare studet.

Mediam denique quandam uiam ingressus Fridericus Iacob quattuor prioribus libris Augusto regnante conditis quintum post theatrum Pompei anno p. Chr. n. 22 restaurari coeptum accessisse uult probante praeter G. Lansonem imprimis A. Cartaultio, nisi quod hic quartum quoque librum Tiberii temporibus adscribit ita quidem, ut totum opus Tiberio demum imperante editum sit eis omnibus locis postmodo immutatis, quibus Octauiani Augusti laudes continerentur.

Iam nostram de poetae aetate sententiam proponamus. Ex duobus carminis locis is terminus definiri potest, post quem Astronomica scripta esse debent. Quorum alter in ea libri quarti parte exstat, ubi poeta docet, quae terrae sub singulis zodiaci sideribus iaceant; ibi de Virgine haec dicit:

iv. 763

Virgine sub casta felix terraque marique  
est Rhodos, hospitium recturi principis  
orbem,  
tumque domus uere solis, cui tota sacrata  
est,  
cum caperet lumen magni sub Caesare  
mundi.

Quae uerba conspicuae adulationis ad Tiberii secessum Rhodium spectare patet, qui erat inde ab anno a. Chr. n. 6 usque ad annum p. Chr. n. 2. Atqui Tiberius 'recturus princeps' ante annum p. Chr. n. 4 appellari non potuit, quippe qui tunc demum ab Augusto adoptatus et in regni successionis spem ingressus sit. Ex clade autem Variana i. 896 sqq. commemorata sequitur, ut illa quidem primi libri pars anno p. Chr. n. 9 peracto composita sit.

Neque minus certo alterum illum terminum constituere licet, ante quem saltem quattuor priores libros scriptos esse necesse est—quintum omni huius quaestionis disceptandae ansa carere infra elucebit—nimirum ante obitum Octauiani Augusti, cui poetam Astronomicam dedicasse persuasum habemus. Quod ut probemus, demonstrabimus ad unum hunc principem omnes illos locos esse referendos, quibus Augusti nomen occurrit, ab eis quidem libri primi uersibus exordientes, quibus poeta uim

cometarum mala rei publicae imminetia praesagiendi exemplis illustrat e recenti eius rerum memoria petitis, quorum ne uno quidem, id quod nemo casui tribuerit, res post Augusti annum emortualem gestae tanguntur. Philippensi enim pugna allata, qua eisdem in campis atque Pharsalico proelio imperium Romanum cum suismet uiribus conflixisse Manilius Vergilium secutus (Ge. i. 487 sqq. cf. Ou. Met. xv. 823 sqq.) queritur, sic pergit:

i. 913

perque patris pater Augustus uestigia uicit.  
ne dum finis erat: restabant Actia bella  
dotali commissa acie, repetitaeque rerum  
alea, et in ponto quaesitus rector Olympi.

De caeli igitur fortuna ad Actium secundum Manilii opinionem pugnatum est, cf. v. 52; qua ex pugna uter superior discessit, hunc quamquam etiam tunc in terra uersantem simul rectorem Olympi esse factum animo ille sibi fingit. Sane nouum poetae Augustei, quod fertur, aevi genus adulandi neque uero inauditum in ea ciuitate, a qua iam aliquot annos uiuo imperatori diuini honores tribuebantur.

Quae interpretatio egregie fulcitur eis eiusdem libri uersibus, quibus gens Iulia, ut de caelo descenderit, ita caelum repleuisse a poeta dicitur Ioue Augustum imperii socium sibi adiungente:

i. 798

Venerisque ab origine proles  
Iulia descendit caelo caelumque repleuit,  
quod regit Augustus socio per signa  
Tonante.

Atque Augusti sub imperio poeta sperat fore, ut caelum, scilicet supra Romanum orbem terrarum sese pandens, maius crescat:

iv. 933

ne dubites homini diuinos credere uisus;  
iam facit ipse deos mittitque ad sidera  
numen,  
maius et Augusto crescet sub principe  
caelum.

Augusti autem appellatione Octavianum Augustum significari euidentissime eis uerbis probatur, quae illius thema, quod astrologi dicunt, continent. Etenim poeta de sideribus se inuicem uidentibus audientibusque disserens de Capricorno in se ipsum oculos conuertente haec docet:

ii. 507

contra Capricornus in ipsum  
conuertit uisus. quid enim mirabitur ille  
maius, in Augusti felix cum fulserit ortum?

Atqui Augustus M. Tullio Cicerone C. Antonio cons. VIII. Kal. Octob. natus est (Suet. Aug. c. 5 et 31), ut Libra eius sidus natalicium esse necesse sit. Sed eodem Suetonio (*ib.* c. 94) teste Augustus ipse Theogenem mathematicum de genitura sua consulturus sub Capricorno se natum esse professus fausto responso reddito nummum argenteum nota Capricorni insignem percussit. At Capricornum sol etiam tunc mense Decembri percurrebat. Quem nodum iam Michael Fayus in sua Astronomicon editione et Fridericus Anton propria quaestione felicissime ita expediuerunt, ut Augustum singularem quandam astrologorum morem secutum non tam ad nascentiam suam *i.e.* τὴν ἐμφανῆ γένεσιν quam ad conceptionem *i.e.* τὴν ἐν τῇ μητρὶ γένεσιν in themate constituendo respexisse demonstrarent. Capricorni autem sidus propterea ille procul dubio Librae praetulit, quod Capricornus regibus potissimum principibusque procreandis fauere putabatur. Cf. Firmic. Math. viii. 28. Gardthausen, Augustus und seine Zeit ii. 1, p. 16 sqq.

Ergo si tibi persuasero illos tres locos i. 913 sqq. 798 sqq. iv. 933 sqq. de Octaviano Augusto eoque etiam tunc uiuo esse interpretandos, multo promptius de reliquis locis mecum facies.

Nam de austrinis signis disserturus Manilius breuem comparisonem hemisphaerii meridionalis cum nostro septentrionali instituens, non minor, ait, illis est mundus nec peior lumine, nec minus numerosa illic oriuntur sidera :

i. 384

cetera non cedunt ; uno uincuntur in astro Augusto, sidus nostro quod contigit orbi, Caesar nunc terris, post caelo maximus auctor.

Itemque de uiuo etiam tunc Augusto uelim interpreteris ultimos primi libri uersus, quibus post bella ciuilia tandem finita aeternam pacem a dis petit :

i. 922

iam bella quiescant,  
atque adamanteis Discordia uincta catenis  
aeternos habeat frenos in carcere clausa.  
sit pater inuictus patriae, sit Roma sub illo ;  
cumque deum caelo dederit, non quaerat in orbe.

pater Augustus (u. 913), inquit, quoad uiuet, uiuat inuictus, idemque simulatque caelo redditus erit, urbi Romae praesens adsit, ne Romani unquam numen eius desiderent. Sic poeta ultimis primi libri uerbis quodammodo

ad eiusdem libri exordium redit, ubi eandem pacem carminis sui fautricem praedicat eundemque Caesarem pari patris patriae appellatione exornat :

i. 7 hunc mihi tu, Caesar, patriae princeps-  
que paterque,  
qui regis augustis parentem legibus orbem  
concessumque patri mundum deus ipse mereris,  
10 das animum uiresque facis ad tanta canenda.  
13 hoc sub pace uacat tantum.

Quodsi quis contra dixerit fieri non potuisse, quin animus Caesaris ualde offenderetur suprema eius hora bis (i. 387, 926) quamuis leniter tacta, uereor ne illi nimis mollibus ueteres fuisse animis uideantur, quos his de rebus multo fortius sensisse praeter alios testes—cf. Verg. Ge. i. 24 sqq.—Ouidius et Lucanus declarant :

Ou. Met. xv. 868

tarda sit illa dies et nostro serior aeuo,  
qua caput Augustum, quem temperat, orbe relicto,  
accedit caelo faueatque penatibus absens.

Luc. i. 45

te (scil. Neronem), cum statione peracta  
astra petes serus, praelati regia caeli  
excipt gaudente polo.

Restat ut Iacobi sententiam, quam neque pauci neque mediocris auctoritatis critici secuti sunt, reiciamus. Docet igitur quintum librum sub Tiberio esse scriptum, 'Pompeia monumenta ueteris triumphi semper recentia flammis' (v. 513 sq.) de theatro Pompei flammis absumpto interpretatus, quod se restitutum esse Tiberius promiserit ; quod opus etsi imperator imperfectum reliquerit (Suet. Tib. 47), tamen nihil poetam impedire potuisse, quominus hanc in eum laudem poetarum more conferret. Itaque cum illud aedificium anno 22 restitui coeptum esset, librum quintum post hoc tempus esse compositum.—Neque uero de aedificio ullo ibi omnino agitur, sed de auri artificibus, gemmarum sculptoribus musuariisque sub Cassio procreatis, ut illa 'Pompeia monumenta ueteris triumphi' de operibus bratteatorum inauratorumque arte ornatis atque de gemmis uario colorum splendore renitentibus intellegenda sint, quibus artificibus Pompeius teste Plinio Nat. Hist. xxxvii. 12 sqq. uim maximam ex Asia in Urbem translata deis sacrauerat. Quo argumento reiecto ne unum quidem remanet

indiciū, quo Tiberii demum temporibus hoc carmen conditum esse euincatur.

Ceterum, ut hoc addamus, carmen imperfectum est; etenim non solum finis libri quinti desideratur, sed etiam tota ea pars facile integrum completura librum, qua poeta post orientium occidentium quoque siderum zodiacorum partus describere debuit, de quibus se uerba esse facturum v. 27 sq. pollicetur; praeterea omnis planetarum doctrina ii. 965 ab eo promissa deest. Utraque pars utrum temporum iniquitate nobis erepta, an poeta ad has res tractandas omnino non adgressus sit, equidem diiudicare non ausim; hoc certum est Firmicum octauum praecipue Matheseos librum conscribentem, nisi ex eodem hauserit fonte atque poeta, id quod ueri esse similis nobis uidetur, plenius esse opere Maniliano quam nos usum.

Atque Graecis potissimum auctoribus, quod per se consentaneum et iam ueteribus interpretibus perspectum est, poetam sideralem suam debere scientiam, praecipue quatenus ad terrae atque caeli naturam et imaginem depingendam spectat, ut ex ipsius uerbis concludere licet, cf. e.g. ii. 897, 909, 916, 937, iv. 818, ita argumentis ad persuadendum aptissimis demonstrauerunt Hermannus Diels, *Doxogr. gr.* p. 196 adn. 3 et Mus. Rhen. xxxiv. 1879, p. 490 sq. et Franciscus Malchin praeclara sua dissertatione anni 1893, quae est de auctoribus quibusdam, qui Posidonii libros meteorologicos adhibuerunt. Aratae autem doctrinae uestigia in Manilii opere apparentia Ernestus Maass in editione sua Arati Phaenomenon praestantissima diligentissime denotauit. Examines etiam uelim, quae Georgius Thiele<sup>1</sup> doctissime de caeli signis disputat imprimis pp. 46, 61, 148.

De *codicibus* breuis esse possum nonnulla ex eis repetens, quae in dissertatione de M. Manilii emendandi ratione fusius disputaui. Eos ex uno archetypo atque eo lectionibus deprauatis ualde corrupto et uersibus primi, tertii, quarti libri de sede sua amotis perturbato lacunisque aperte hiantibus uitato defluxisse, accurata librorum manu scriptorum collatio euidentissime ostendit. Qua collatione simul hoc si non demonstrandi necessitate certissima, at probabilitate tamen ratiocinandi satis ualida indagasse nobis uidetur exemplar illius archetypi fuisse minimum xviij. foliorum in ternionum speciem complicatorum singulisque in paginis, id quod iam Fr. Jacob uidit, uersuum uicenorum binorum cursiuis quidem litteris

exaratorum. Inde igitur hi codices originem ducunt: I. Codex quondam **Gemblacensis** (G) nunc Bruxellis inter libros bibliothecae ducum Burgundionum numero 10012 notatus, 18, 5 x 11 centm., membranaceus saeculi X. exeuntis uel xi. ineuntis foliorum 125 (numerus 75 bis appictus est), quorum folia 1-996 carmen Manilii, reliqua 'Prisciani Grammatici Periegesin secundum Dionisium' continent. De inscriptione supra p. 296 dictum est. Circum titulum 'Malius poeta' litteris haud ita clavis haec scripta sunt: 'Liber hic. a. 1678 comodatus D. Sherburno per (?) D. Samuelem Carr. Bibliopolam Londinensem a P. Daniele Papebrochio Scôctis Iesu Antuerpiae. eidem restitui debet, eo (?) stitutus est'; in margine: t. m. 8°.—Eduardus ille Sherburnus professor Oxoniensis, hoc ut in transcurso moneamus, uersionem Anglicam Manilii commentario addito Londini a. 1675 confecit.—Ceterorum librorum et tituli et subscriptiones poetae nomen exhibentes desunt. Sub *Astronomicon* fine manu saeculi XIV. haec scripta sunt: 'Liber iste pertinet monasterio Gemblacensi'; atque sub fine Prisciani carminis: 'Lib. S. Petri. Gemblacensis.'

Scriba codicis, qui raras rasuras arasque praebet emendationes ab ipso librario inter scribendum factas, ut in ductibus litterarum pingendis per totum carmen admodum et eleganti et constanti, quae codicum antiquorum propria esse solet, manu usus est, ita compendiis scribendi nisi in usitatissimis uoculis uocabulorumque consociationibus abstinuit, uerba singula bene distinxit, falsum aut obscurum siquid ei esse uidebatur, requirendi signo y in margine apposito denotauit, capitula tantum non semper intra ipsum uerborum ordinem scripsit. Quindecim fere locis duae manus saeculi XV. uel XVI. occurrunt, quarum altera imprimis lacunas uersuum nonnullorum suppleuit. In singulis paginis uiceni singuli uersus leguntur, qui numerus inde a folio 49 constanter ad uicenos binos auctus est. Hunc librum olim a Francogallis Lutetiam Parisiorum esse translatum, hoc sigillum et in prima et in ultima eius pagina impressum declarat: BIBLIOTHEQUE NATIONALE.

Atque primus Iacobus Susius hunc codicem contulit, qui *Astronomicon* curans editionem, quam tamen non perfecit, discrepantes huius libri scripturas in margine exemplaris sui adnotauit. Eidemque libro multas et optimas lectiones debet Ludouicus Carrio, nonnullas non sine aliqua magniloquentia pro suis uenditans emendationibus. Attamen sospitator demum ille Manilii Iosephus Scaliger tertiis curis

<sup>1</sup> Georg Thiele, *Antike Himmelsbilder*. Berlin, 1898.



Astronomica editurus hunc thesaurum Gemblacensem aperuit apertumque poetae reddidit. Etenim hic heros philologorum admirabili rerum caelestium exstructis scientia operibusque poetarum maxime Latinorum et recensendis et interpretandis uere natus illo Susii adiutus subsidio tot et tanta uitia uulgati textus sustulit, tot locis ad id usque tempus obscuris lucem attulit splendidissimam felicissimae ductus sagacitate remotissima quaeque indagauit, ut tunc demum Manilius sui ipsius similis fieri coeperit. Atque Bentleius quoque, qui Astronomicon editionem praeclarissimam exeunte saeculo xvii. susceptam anno demum 1739 Londini in lucem prodire iussit edendi munere ob aetatem proiectam ad fratris sui filium delato, primo loco Gemblacensem librum ut 'longe optimum et antiquissimum' in eo poeta emendando sequendum censet, qui 'omnium scriptorum quotquot sint corruptissimus sit, adeo ut uariae in eo lectiones uerborum fere exaequant numerum, uersuum certe longe exsuperent.' Quas tamen lectiones saepius uel in optimis codicibus ita esse ineptas cum iudicet, ut omnem paene fidem eis abrogare, ita inter se contrarias et plane oppositas, ut coniecturis uel maxime a recepta lectione distantibus locum dare uideantur (praef. p. xv.), haud raro factum est, ut summus ille Anglorum criticus singularis profecto diuinationis, qua etiam post Scaligeri curationes efficacissimas permulta carminis membra etiam tunc grauiter aegrotantia uel aperte contorta felicissime sanauit, tamen quasi effrenato perductus aliquo corrigendi impetu uel optimas huius codicis scripturas audacissime mutaret uersusque haud paucos sententiarum conexui minime aduersantes e textu eiceret.

Iam uero Fridericus Iacob, nouissimus Astronomicon editor, Gemblacensem codicem, cuius memoriam e Scaligeri et Bentlei notis et ex Iacobi Susii ad Nicolaum Heinsium delatis excerptis nouerat, 'antiquitate quidem et lectionibus praestantem iudicat librum, sed aperte interpolatum eoque cautius adhibendum, quanto speciosiores pleraeque interpolationes a prudenti admodum homine profectae sint.'

ii. Hoc codice quinquaginta fere annis recentior est codex **Lipsiensis** 1465 (*L*) in Italia, ut uidetur scriptus, membranaceus, in uniuersitatis bibliotheca conditus, 24, 5 x 18 centm. 96 foliorum duodecim quaternionibus complicatorum; folium primum abscissum, unum folium ultimo quaternioni agglutinatum est; in singulorum quaternionum primae et ultimae paginae margine ima custodes,

qui dicuntur, appicti sunt: numeri continui litteraeque secundum alphabeti ordinem.

In singulis paginis constanter uiceni terni uersus scripti sunt; compendia, si ab usitatissimis recesseris, desunt. Ab eodem scriba, qui etiam rubricandi officio uidetur functus esse—littera C initialis totius carminis egregie ornata est—et pleraeque emendationes factae et capitula minutissimis quidem characteribus in margine notata sunt, unde postea rubris litteris exarati in ipsum uerborum ordinem migrare debebant, ubi nunc uersus aut singuli aut bini hiant; itemque subscriptionibus titulisque efficiendis in fine librorum singuli uel bini uersus uacui relictii sunt; uersibus plane corruptis  $\gamma$  signum appositum est. Secundi libri capitula et huic libro praemissa sunt et suo loco in margine redeunt.—Raro altera manus emendatrix occurrit eaque haud mala, sed ob atramentum pallidissimum difficillima lectu.—De genuina inscriptione erasa uide supra p. 296; a principio ibi similem fuisse titulum testatur **NOMICON** fragmentum, quod infra **ASTRONOMICON** uocem etiam nunc e uestigiis rubris quamuis tenuibus erui potest. Receptor manus, quae compluria scholia nullius fere pretii in margine adscripsit, in fine carminis haec addidit:

Carmina praeclaras signant caeli regiones  
Fistula quas cecinit Christiani docta magistri.

Hunc non esse eundem atque Germanicum illum codicem, quem Scaliger manibus tenuit (prol. 5), utriusque libri lectiones docent. In Bentlei usum eum contulerunt Ioach. Fridericus Feller anno 1693 et Godofr. Richter a. 1709; deinde Iustus Vierschrodt medio saeculo XVIII. Manilium editurus et abhinc annos fere LX. Fridericus Iacob eum inspexerunt.

iii. Codex olim **Cusanus** (*C*) nunc Bruxelensis 10699 saeculi XII. membranaceus 27 x 19 centm., sedecim foliorum duobus quaternionibus complicatorum in singulis paginis habet binas columnas, quarum singulae sunt uersuum septuagenorum tam minutis litteris pictorum, ut minima uersus longitudo sit 3, 5 centm., maxima 4, 5 centm. De inscriptione supra p. 296 diximus; subscriptiones desunt, quae quidem poetae nomen prodant. Capitula plerumque in margine apposita sunt; finem autem libri primi excipit continuo conspectus capitulorum libri secundi sua sede redeuntium, qui conspectus pariter atque in *L* spatium quindecim uersuum complet.

iv. Codex quondam **Vossianus** 390 (*V*), nunc in bibliotheca Lugdunensi Batauorum



sub numero 3 asseruatus, chartaceus 22 x 24 centm. 165 foliorum, quorum folia 1 ad 68 Manilii carmen continent manu et negligentissima et ineleganti scriptum, ut difficillime legatur. Verba saepissime male distincta; compendia liberiore scribae arbitrio usitata sunt, ut uera lectio interdum dubia sit. Numerus uersuum inconstanter a uersibus 24 ad 28 in singulis paginis procedit. Capitula intra uerborum ordinem leguntur, nonnulla spatio relicto ommissa sunt; conspectus capitulorum libri secundi in fronte huius libri exstat. Titulus praefixus est hic: M. Mallii eqom astronomicon || diuo oct quirino aug proemium lib'. pr. subscriptiones, quibus nomen poetae declaratur, habet haec: Marci Mallii astronomicon liber primus (tertius) explicit Secundus (quartus) incipit. M. mallii boeni astronomicon liber II explicit feliciter incipit tertius. Sub fine carminis: Deo gracias anno 1470 finitus Ianuario.—Hunc librum primus Bentleius ad Astronomica emendanda adhibuit ea usus collatione, quae orae editionis Scaligeranae anni 1600 adscripta nunc in bibliotheca Gottingensi asseruatur. Fridericus autem Iacob hoc codice quasi fundamento in poetae uerbis constituendis usus est.

v. Codex **Matritensis M**, 31 bibliothecae<sup>1</sup> nationalis saeculi XV. a Gustavo Loewe 1879 Matriti repertus et ab eo posteaque a Robinsone Ellis collatus cf. *The Classical Review* uol. vii. 1893. p. 310–11, 356–58, 406–9; *ib.* uol. viii. 1894. p. 4–6, p. 138–41, p. 289–92. Quo de libro Alfredus Klotz amicus meus in suae Statii Siluarum editionis p. viii. haec praefatur: “constat codex foliis chartaceis 115 altis 30,5 cent., latis 20,7 cent. quorum duodena cohaerent, primum autem primi senionis folium abscissum est . . . quadrageni ferme uersus in singulis paginis scriptisunt. inuolucrum non ab initio adfuisse et primorum foliorum sordibus demonstratur et schedulis typis inscriptis, quae ad tergum fulciendum glutino sunt insertae. Continetur autem codice sicut in tergo scriptum est: Manilii Astronomicon et Statii Papini Syluae M.S.—eadem manu utrumque opus conscriptum est; ac Manilii quidem i. 82—v. 745 leguntur fol. 1<sup>a</sup>–54<sup>a</sup>; I. 1–81 folio primo . . . abscisso perierunt . . . supra primos Manilii uersus manus recentior . . . scripsit Manilii Astronomicon et Statii Papinii Syluae et Asconius Pedianus in Ciceronem Flacci nonnulla’ (‘et Valerii

Flacci nonnulla’ Ellis), uerba Asconius et q.s. expuncta sunt.” Ceterum utrum codices M 31 et X 81, in quo Asconius et Valerii Flacci I. 1–IV. 317 insunt, olim unum effecisse librum, id quod nonnullis uiris doctis uisum est necne, disceptari non potest nisi codice utroque diligenter inspecto. Nomen poetae his in subscriptionibus commemoratur: M. MANILI ASTRONOMI CON LIBER PRIMVS EXPLICIT INCIPIT SECVNDVS. M. MANLII BOENI ASTRONOMICON LIBER II. etc. M. MILNII ASTRONOMICON LIB. III. etc.

vi. Codex **Florentinus (F)** bibliothecae Medic. Laurentianae plut. 30, 15 forma quaternaria saeculo XV. nitide scriptus in foliis membranaceis 93, uicenis quaternis uersibus in singulis paginis redeuntibus. Tituli et subscriptionis species est haec: Marci Manilii poetae clarissimi astronomicon ad Caesarem Augustum liber primus. Marci Manilii Astronomicon ad Augustum liber finit. Folium 92 Marci Manilii mathematici uitam exhibet, qua poeta cum Pliniano illo Manilio mathematico confunditur. folium 93 continet capitula singulorum librorum uno conspectu proposita.<sup>2</sup>

His chartis uisum est adicere recentiorum observationum Manilianarum summarium, lectorum huius Ephemeridis commoditatibus, ut speramus, inseriturum:

**Lachmann**, Carolus, de aetate Manilii. Diss. inaug. Gottingae, 1815, cf. *Kleinere Schriften* II. 42 sqq.

**Jacob**, Fridericus, de Manilio poeta. Progr. Luebeck 1832, 1833, 1834, 1835, 1836.

**Haupt**, Mauricius, Opuscula II. 341 sqq. III. 43, 106, 473, 583.

**Breiter**, Theodor, de emendatione Manilii. Progr. Hamm 1854.

— Zu Manilius in *Fleckeiseni Annal. Philol.* (u. 139), 1889, p. 193 sqq., 693 sqq., 845 sqq.—*ib.* (u. 147) 1893 p. 417 sqq.

**Anton**, Aug. Friedr., de sideribus Augusti nataliciis. Progr. der Klosterschule Rossleben. Halle 1861.

**Bechert**, Malwin, de M. Manilii emendandi ratione. Diss. inaug. in Stud. Lips. uol. I. (1878) p. 1 sqq.

— de M. Manilio Astronomicorum poeta. Progr. Lipsiae 1891.

**Freier**, Bertholdus, de M. Manilii quae feruntur Astronomicon aetate. Diss. inaug. Gottingae 1880.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. W. v. *Hartel* Bibliotheca patrum Latin. Hispaniensis, p. 454 sq. et Sitzungsberichte der philos.-hist. Classe der kaiserl. Akademie der Wissenschaften. Wien 1886, uol. 113, pp. 240 et 276.

<sup>2</sup> Collationem huius codicis debeo benignitati Curtii Fischeri nonnullosque locos Iohannes Ilberg denuo contulit; utrique amico gratias ago quam maximas.

- Woltjer, J.**, de Manilio poeta. Progr. Gymnas. Groningae 1881.
- Cramer, Adolfus**, de Manilii qui dicitur elocutione. Diss. inaug. Argentorati 1882.
- Der Infinitiv bei Manilius in Commentationibus in honorem Guilelmi Studemund. Strassburg 1889 p. 61 sqq.
- Ueber die ältesten Ausgaben von Manilius' *Astronomica*. Progr. Ratibor 1893. Cf. censura Theodori Breiter in Wochenschr. für klass. Philol. 1893, No. 29, 802 sq.
- Lanson, G.** de Manilio poeta eiusque ingenio. Paris 1887. Cf. A. Cartault, Revue critique d'histoire et de littérature 1888 No. 15, p. 283 sq.
- Rossberg, Konrad**, Zu Manilius in Fleckeiseni Annal. Philol. (u. 139), 1889, p. 705 sqq.—ib. (u. 145) 1892 p. 74 sqq.
- Thomas, Paul**, Lucubrationes Manilianae. Inest codicis Gemblacensis collatio in Recueil de travaux publiés par la faculté de philosophie et lettres 1<sup>re</sup> fascicule, Gand 1888. Cf. censurae Conradi Rossberg in Berlin. Philol. Wochenschr. 1889 No. 34, 1074 sqq. et Bertholdi Freier in Wochenschr. für klass. Philol. 1889, No. 34, 923 sqq. et A. Cartaultii in Revue critique d'histoire et de littérature 1889 No. 10, p. 193 sq.
- Notes et conjectures sur Manilius. Extrait du tome XLVI des Mémoires couronnés et autres Mémoires publiés par l'Académie royale de Belgique 1892. Cf. censura A. Cartaultii in Revue critique d'histoire et de littérature 1892 No. 28, 28 sq.
- Notes critiques sur Manilius IV. 37 sqq. Extrait des Bull. de l'Acad. roy. de Belgique, 3<sup>e</sup> sér., t. XXIX. No. 4, p. 548 sqq. 1895.
- Kraemer, Augustus**, de Manilii qui fertur *Astronomicis*. Diss. inaug. Marburgi 1890.
- Ellis, Robinson**, Noctes Manilianae siue dissertationes in *Astronomica* Manilii. Accedunt coniecturae in Germanici Aratea. Oxonii 1891. Cf. censurae Pauli Thomas, Revue critique 1892 No. 17, 324 sqq. et A. Cartaultii ib. No. 28, 25 sqq., et Conradi Rossberg in Berlin. Philol. Wochenschr. 1892, No. 7, 205 sqq.
- The Madrid MS. of Manilius, Hermath. uol. VIII. No. XIX. 1893, 261 sqq.
- The literary relations of 'Longinus' and Manilius. Classic. Review uol. XIII. 1899, 294.
- Tappertz, Eduardus**, de coniunctionum usu apud Manilium quaestiones selectae. Diss. inaug. Monasterii Guestfalorum 1892.
- Postgate, Joh. P.**, Silua Maniliana. Cantabrigiae 1897. Cf. censurae E. J. Webb in Classical Review uol. XI. 1897, 307 sqq. et Iohannis Tolkieln in Wochenschrift für klass. Philol. 1897, No. 37, 1011 sqq. et R. Helmii in Berlin Philol. Wochenschr. für klass. Philol. 1897, No. 40, 1229 sqq. Cf. censura Ellisii in Hermath. uol. X. No. XXIV. 1898, 122 sqq.
- Siluae Manilianae appendix in Journal of philol. uol. XXV. 1897, 7-1, 266 sqq.
- Upon Manilius in Classical Review uol. XII. 1898, 292 sqq. ib. XIII. 1899, 402. XIV. 1900, 63.
- Housman, A. E.**, Emendations in the first book of Manilius, in Journal of Philol. uol. XXVI. 1898, p. 60 sqq.
- Ramorinus, Felix**, Quo annorum spatio Manilius *Astronomicon* libros composuerit, Firenze-Roma 1898. Cf. censurae R. Helmii in Berlin. Philol. Wochenschr. 1899, No. 10, 303 sq. et Theodori Breiter in Wochenschr. für klass. Philol. 1898, No. 51, 1410.
- v. **Voigt, W.**, Unter welchen Gestirnen wurde Caesar, Agrippa und Tiberius geboren? Philol. uol. LVIII. 1899, 170 sqq.

MALWIN BECHERT.

## NOTES ON SILIUS ITALICUS, IX.—XVII.

## IX.

143 sic fatus, galeam exuit atque  
rigentis  
inuadit nati tremebundis colla lacertis  
attonitoque timens uerbis sanare  
pudorem  
uulneris impressi, telum excusare  
laborat.

This is Bauer's text (with S) and punctuation. The words 'timens . . . sanare pudorem,' suit so ill 'telum exc. lab.' that most edd. of recent date read 'nitens' for 'timens' and change 'que' to 'et' for metre.

I would suggest 'mentis' for 'timens.' In copying the former word 'mētis' would easily become 'mens,' the stroke being ignored, and 'ti' read 'n'—an extremely common blunder in these MSS. When this was corrected by writing 'ti' over 'n,' 'timens' might easily result. 'Que' may be dropped (a colon being put at the end of 144) as a metrical addition by S similar to 'iamque' for 'iam iam' 8. 624, and the flagrant case of 2. 534 *sqq.* where the original of S, by careless omission, has run four lines into one, of seven feet, and S has restored the metre by omitting 'studium.'

Schrader's 'et' after 'impressi' is easy and desirable.

229 subiere leues quos horrida  
misit  
Pyrene populi uarioque auxere tumultu  
flumineum latus

This, the reading of S, seems to me impossible, as it necessitates the rendering of 'auxere' as if it could = 'impleuere.'

Heinsius proposed 'et uario cinxere,' which gives a very good sense. Instead of 'cinxere' I would suggest 'clausere,' the sense being rather 'closed the way to the river side,' (cf. Liv. 22. 47 'nullo circa ad euagandum relicto spatio hinc amnis hinc peditum acies claudebant' of this very part of the field). I can only imagine that the 'l' got read as 'h,' and 'hausere,' becoming as often 'ausere,' was altered to 'auxere.' The change of 'et' before 'uario' to 'que' after it was no doubt metrical.

650 sed comprimit ensem  
nescio qui deus et meme ad grauiora  
reseruat.

'Meme' seems to occur nowhere else. The line calls to one's mind Virgil's

NO. CXXV. VOL. XIV.

nam quid dissimulo aut quae me ad maiora  
reseruo?

Can the reading be?—

at quae me ad grauiora reseruat!

The god prevents me slaying myself—but for how much worse a fate is he keeping me alive. 'At quae me,' would become 'atque me,' 'et me,' and then, possibly, 'me' would be doubled for the metre's sake.

579 passimque uolanti  
celsus telorum fundit Libys aggere  
nimbum.  
stat niueis longum stipata per agmina  
uallum  
dentibus, atque ebori praefixa cominus  
hasta  
fulget ab incuruo directa cacumine  
cuspis.

Thilo has shown the absurdity of the old explanation, that the *hasta* referred to in 582 was fastened to the howdah, which involves taking 'incuruo cacumine' as the elephant's curved back (so Cellarius, cited by Rupertus without comment, and Lewis and Short s.v. *cacumen*). Thilo, however, believes that both the men who are killed by the elephant were killed by its tusks, and reading 'utque' renders 'the point of its tusk shines as though a spear were fixed in front of the ivory.'

Surely there is no need to alter the MSS., no objection to taking the passage to mean that to each tusk a spear was fastened—so that what the tusks failed to pierce, the spear might reach. *Ufens* is clearly killed by the 'sceleratum dentem,' but Tadius is pierced by the 'spicula dentis,' which I take to mean the spears attached to the tusks. The singular 'dentis' will not cause any difficulty, as the word is simply added to define 'spicula.' This rendering alone gives *directa* its true force: at the end of the curving tusk is the straight spear. 'Cominus' must, I suppose, draw attention to the fact that the spear is for thrusting. 'Incuruus' really applies to the 'dens,' of which the 'cacumen' is part.

## X.

157 *sqq.*  
hunc sude quam raptam Libyci per terga  
iacentis  
armiger obtulerat monstri, super inguina  
fixum

X

obtruncat quercuque premit uiolentus obusta.  
Temptarat precibus saeuum lenire furorem,  
sed Stygius primos impleuit feruor hiatus  
et pulmone tenus demisit anhelitus ignem.

'super inguina fixum' is obviously wrong. The lines immediately following show clearly the man was wounded in the face. 'Fixam' should be read: the stake had been planted above the elephant's groin. 'Per' must mean that he passed it to Hannibal over the fallen elephant.

273           cape quaeso hunc, unice rerum  
fessarum, cape cornipedem.

What kind of genitive 'rerum' is here I do not understand. Burmann saw that 'unica spes' was required, though he unfortunately supplied it in place of 'quaeso', which is metrically impossible. It should be read in place of the second 'cape': the common confusion of 's' and 'c' would cause the last letter to drop out before 'cornipedem.' Sil. uses the phrase elsewhere: 10. 48 'Latio sp. un.' (of Paulus, as here), 7. 1 'trepidis sp. un. rebus' (Fabius), cp. 4. 815.

290           perge atque hinc cuspidē fessum  
eripe quadrupedem propere.

This is the vulgate, though Ch and F have 'erige.' 'Propere' is a little tautological after 'eripe': Heinsius suggested 'exige.' I think 'cuspidē' (which can hardly go with 'fessum') supports 'erige,' and would compare two passages of Silius where the idea of 'lifting' is used in connection with a galloping horse: 4. 144 (of a charge) 'suspendunt frenis sublime reductos cornipedes,' 16. 394 (of a spurt) 'tollit se sonipes.' Cp. also 4. 195 'cuspidē flammāt equum.'

420 dux erat exilio collectis Marte Metellus  
sed stirpe haud parui cognominis.

Metellus is leader of the young Romans who wish to abandon Italy. How they can be called 'collecti Marte' is not clear, and 'sed' introduces no real contrast. The only conj. that tries to meet both points is Livineius' *exilis*, but (1) the word is not very likely in this sense, (2) 'Marte' is too far separated from it, (3) 'collectis' is otiose.

I propose for 'collectis' 'non laetus' (cp. 8. 615 O (I V) 'laetos' for 'lectos.' For the phrase 'laetus Marte,' cp. 'laetus bello' 10. 54 'nec bello prospera' 16. 597, and for its appropriateness to Metellus, cp. 47 'pauidi Metelli.' Compare Varro's character in 8. 261, and esp. Fulvius in 12. 469 'non sollertior ense sed genus insignis.'

## XI.

453-458.  
iamque chaos, caecam quondam sine sidere  
molem  
non surgente die, ac mundum sine luce  
canebat.  
tum deus ut liquidi discisset stagna  
profundi  
tellurisq; globum media compage locasset;  
ut celsum superis habitare dedisset  
Olympum  
castaque Saturni monstrabat saecula patris.

These lines doubtless come from Silius: they contain a favourite phrase of his, an example of syncope dear to him, and a specimen of rhythm far too common in his poem. But they can hardly stand here, in Teuthras' song concerning the lyrists Amphion, Arion, Chiron and Orpheus. In connection with each of the other 3 lyrists, the song mentions at least one celebrated event in which the lyre played a part. But of Chiron's it only says that it could subdue the anger of the sea or even of hell. Then come these lines, which could only mean that the theme of Chiron's song was the creation. But (1) we are not told what was the theme of the other lyrists' songs (2) as no special event is mentioned in connection with Chiron (as there is in the other cases) no one song of his could be specially selected here. The edd. who read 'iamque' at the beginning of the passage do not mend matters, for (1) Teuthras cannot here be subject to 'canebat' as the story of Orpheus is told (459 sqq.) in Oratio Recta and (2) it would be ridiculous to represent him as introducing a cosmogony in the midst of a poem on the lyre.

Where then must the lines be read? In 291 sqq. Teuthras sings of Jove and his descendants, the ancestors of Capys. If we insert these 6 lines before 291 all will run smoothly: the harper sings of Chaos, of Saturn and his 'casta saecula' and passes thence to Jupiter and his 'laetos per furta amores.' The only difficulty is 'namque' in 291 where 'iamque' must be read (as, curiously enough, many edd. do now, though it makes nonsense with the lines as at present printed. I imagine 'iamque' got altered, on the analogy of Vergil's 'namque canebat uti' etc., after the lines got displaced. The displacement was doubtless due to the similar beginnings 'namque' and 'iamque.' How they got into their present position, in Teuthras' second song, I cannot imagine: it would be too ingenious to suppose that the similarity of the endings

of 452 and 459 which come together by my hypothesis offended an interpolator.

## XII.

## 242 spoliatque uidentem

In the face of Aen. 10. 462 'cernat semineci sibi me rapere arma,' I think 'uidentem' may stand.

468 sqq.

bis septem demissa neci (nec substitit agmen)  
milia : bis septem quae...ducebat...  
Fulvius.

Silius has just told us how Centennius got annihilated by Hannibal. With the punctuation given above, that of the vulgate, the words 'bis...milia' refer to this disaster. The next clause, beginning 'bis septem' clearly refers to another event, the defeat of Fulvius.

Against this punctuation I would observe (1) the introduction of this second disaster comes very abruptly, (2) the supplying of 'milia demissa neci' from the other clause is rather awkward, (3) Livy says Centennius had 8,000 men of whom 'uix mille' escaped, Fulvius 18,000, of whom 2,000 escaped. Sil. is not a historian, or this point would be final.

I believe then the fresh disaster begins at 468, and that 'bis septem' in 469 is merely a repetition to prepare the way for the relative clause 'quae...ducebat'—a resumptive use exceedingly common after proper nouns but not confined to them, and very natural after a parenthesis. Cp. in particular 3. 426 ('deus' repeated after parenthesis 'si credere fas est'), 11. 463 ('mater' after an abl. absolute).

479 sed non, ut scitum celerare ad moenia  
Poenum,  
astabat res ulla loco.

On these words follow a description of the haste with which the various generals came to Rome's relief. That the idea is 'nothing remained as it was,' is supported by the words 'Nola uis omnis et Arpis...Fabi... arma ferebat.'

'Astat' cannot stand, and Bauer's 'abstat' (=aberat) apart from its rarity does not seem to me to satisfy the context. Heinsius conjectured 'restabat spes' and, though 'spes' is quite unnecessary, 'restabat' would be acceptable if nothing better could be got. I would suggest 'nunc' for

'non'—a very easy correction<sup>1</sup>—and 'haud stabat' in 480. 'Haud' has become 'ad' in another passage which has given much trouble, 11. 164, where Burmann's 'haud uersam' for 'aduersa(m)' of MSS. is certainly the best correction yet made.

684 rursus in arma uocat clipeoque tremendum  
inrepat atque uenus imitatur murmura caeli.

For 'uenus' the vulgate is 'armis,' though (1) 'arma' precedes in 684 and (2) 'clipeco' makes it unnecessary. The Vergilian parallel (6. 590 demens qui nimbos et non imitabile fulmen aere...simularat) points to 'amens.'

## XIII.

261 mussat perfidiae ductorque caputque senatus  
Virrius a Poeno nullam docet esse salutem.

The usual punctuation is a comma after Virrius, so that Virrius is subject of 'mussat.' If we put the stop after *senatus* the construction is eased a good deal, and I would suggest this if the text be kept.

Nevertheless, I cannot but suppose 'perfidiae ductor' does refer to Virrius, being a reproduction of Livy's 'Virrius defectionis ab Romanis auctor' in the corresponding passage of his work (26. 13). If that passage be read I think it will be seen that

mussat perfidiae ductor, coetuque senatus  
Virrius, etc.

is at least a plausible conjecture, cp. 11. 67 'coetu patrum ingentique senatu.' If 'coetu' became *coceptu*, mere transposition would produce *caput* (cp. ceptantis LFO captantis V for ceptantis 2. 275).

673 cuncta mihi calcata meoque subibat  
germano deuexa iugum Tartessia tellus.

Surely 'deuexa' is meaningless here. Read 'deuicta'; the mere reading of 'i' as 'e' ('deuecta') would lead to the reading of the MSS. Cp. 16. 646 'tota subisset Sidonium possessa iugum Tartessia tellus.'

799 heroum effigies maiorisque accipit umbras  
ire uiro stupet Aeacide.

So the MSS. Most edd. put a stop at 'umbras' and read 'inde uiro.' To me the addition of 'uiro' to 'Aeacide' seems un-

<sup>1</sup> 'mox' is a little further off the MSS., or I should prefer it.



likely. I would put the stop not after *umbras*, but before *stupet* and read *uiros*, '*Maiores umbras uiros*' will be an apposition quite in the manner of Silius. Cp. 1. 621 '*hic Punica bella Aegatis cernas*', 7. 434 '*Atlantem et Calpen extrema habitabimus antra*', 11. 191 '*aderat* (so all MSS.) *Autololes numerosa cohors*.'

## XIV.

307 *pascitur adiutus Volcanus turbine venti  
gliscentemque trahens turris per uiscera labem  
perque altam molem et toties crescentia tecta  
scandit ovans.*

In 309 Cm's '*crescentia*' is universally read. S has '*nascentia*,' which I prefer. If Silius were describing the gradual growth of the building '*crescentia*' would be in place, but he is here describing the standing tower in which each story as it comes to an end, sees the beginning of a new one. In all the exx. cited for '*cresco*' (in connection with a bird-catcher's rod, a heap of dead, a series of tumblers standing one above the other) the act of growing is emphasised. This theory is supported by line 301 '*tabulata decem cui crescere Graius fecerat*,' where the act of building is described. The presence of the word in line 301 is at once an argument against its use in 309 and an explanation of its being substituted here for '*nascentia*.' Its substitution *might* be due to the first letter of '*crepantia*' immediately under it. '*Nascentia*' seems to me '*exquisitius*'; it is paralleled by 3. 530 where '*nascitur altera moles*' is used of the fresh ridges of the Alps appearing as one is surmounted.

568 Europe niuei sub imagine tauri  
ucta Ioui

So most edd., though LFO have '*Ioue*,' which I would keep as (1) Sil. uses the abl. of the agent rather freely (cp. Mayor on Plin. ep. 3. 19. 6 and esp. 6. 642 '*turbatus Ioue*') and (2) in any case the analogy of '*uectus equo*' makes the abl. as easy.

## XV.

467 tunc Alabim, Murrum atque Dracen  
demisit ad umbras.

I have searched in vain for a parallel in Sil. to this use of '*atque*' with the third name, the first two being unconnected. I

would read '*Maurumque Dracen*,' In l. 457 S had '*mauroque*' for '*murroque*'—a more natural mistake.

## XVI.

41 subitoque tumultu  
caeduntur passim coepti munimina  
ualli  
imperfecta super contexere herbida  
lapsos  
pondera.

So all recent edd. taking '*caeduntur*' in sense of '*demolished*.' But (1) in that case the clause beginning with '*super contexere*' tells us of the men's burial without first mentioning their death. (2) *caesura* distinctly requires '*super*' to belong to the previous sentence. Translate '*they are cut down right and left, on the incomplete rampart, and as they fell the masses of turf covered them over*.' A rather pathetic touch for Silius.

320 pronique ac similes certantibus ore  
secuntur  
quisque suos currus magnaue uolantibus idem  
uoce locuntur equis. quatitur certamine  
circus  
certantum ac nulli mentem non abstulit ardor.  
instant praeceptis et equos clamore gubernant.

Though in 12. 268–274 Silius has *certamine*, *certatim* and then *certamine* again, it is hardly possible to suppose he wrote '*certamine certantum*.' Bentley conjectured '*hortantum*,' which I believe is in the right direction. I would, however, suggest '*spectantum*,' as '*hortantum*' anticipates '*instant praeceptis*' of the next line. That '*praeceptis*' (the reading of S) is right there I have no doubt, and Bentley himself approved of it. '*Praecipites*' (apparently a correction of Modius, but see Blass p. 204) is generally read, but the whole context suggests that the spectators, not the drivers, are meant.

468 subit aspersus prima lanugine  
malas  
Baeticus: hoc dederat puero cognomen  
ab amne  
Corduba, et haud paruo certamina laeta  
fouebat.

470 is explained to mean '*haud paruo sumptu pueri certamina sustentauit ut cum aliis ciuitatibus praestantia et sumptu sui athletae certaret*.' But would not one

expect details to be given of the splendid 'equipment' given by Corduba to its favourite. The other readings 'parco certamine' (based on the 'parto certamine' of S) and 'parce certamina' (Modius' suggestion) have the same meaning.

If C's reading be kept, I should prefer to take 'haud paruo' metaphorically—'at no small cost to their peace of mind.' I do not think this very likely, and would therefore suggest 'a paruo': Baeticus began the career of victory early.

## XVII.

176                      se, triste profatu,  
uidisse, arderent cum bina in nocte  
        silenti  
castra.

The MSS. have 'profatur.' Is it not simpler to read

se triste profatur

vidisse :

'They (legati 171) proclaim that they have seen a mournful sight'? Sil. has 'profor' c. Acc. and inf. 2. 384.

349                                    ipsa malorum  
non plus Carthago tulit exhaustique  
   laboris  
quam pro Cadmea† tulisti exercita  
   gente.

'Tulisti' is perhaps the clearest trace we have of a gloss in the archetype of our MSS. If so there is no need to attempt to follow it in emending. I have thought 'coniux tu' would make a suitable stop gap. Curiously enough *coniux tu* is not so far from *tulisti*, when we bear in mind how often *c = t*, *o = u*, *i = l*, and *x = s*.

WALTER C. SUMMERS.

### THE CENSUS OF SULPICIUS QUIRINIUS.

WE learn from recently discovered papyri that in Roman Egypt a census was regularly held every fourteen years. The origin of the practice is not known. We might *a priori* suppose that it existed under the Ptolemies, like most institutions of Roman Egypt, but no proof of this has yet been found nor anything approaching a proof. The earliest case of the fourteen-year census which is at present proven by direct evidence belongs to A.D. 48: an imperfect record from Oxyrhynchus very probably refers to A.D. 20 and another, also imperfect, to A.D. 34 or 20. For the period before A.D. 20 we have no precise evidence, though Wilcken argues from two documents of B.C. 19-18 that the fourteen-year census had not been instituted by that date. It is obviously not improbable that the census was instituted previous to A.D. 20 and indeed by Augustus. If that be so, we should expect its first instance to be in A.D. 9 or B.C. 8 or possibly B.C. 23, as I gather that Mr. Grenfell would prefer (*Oxyrh. Papyri* II. 209.)

So far, the question concerns only the internal arrangements of one province. Width of interest has been lent to it by Prof. Ramsay's conjecture that the system of a fourteen-year census obtained also in Syria and was in fact the system producing the census which St. Luke synchronizes with the birth of Christ. Of that census St. Luke observes αὕτη ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου.

That is to say, the census of the Nativity was the first of its series and was held while Quirinius was governor of Syria. I do not wish to discuss Prof. Ramsay's theory in general. But I should like to observe that if his preliminary conjecture be true and the fourteen-year census did obtain in Syria under Augustus, some very curious coincidences result. We know, firstly, that Quirinius governed Syria in A.D. 6: we know also that he then held a census of some sort; we know also that A.D. 6 is a proper year for a fourteen-year census, and lastly St. Luke tells us that the census of Quirinius which he mentions was the first of its kind. If coincidences mean anything, they mean here that the fourteen-year census was instituted or at least first carried out in A.D. 6. This is, of course, an impossible date for the Nativity, but it is not otherwise unsuitable. Considerable financial and other changes were then made elsewhere in the Empire, and in the East a Roman Procurator came to rule Judæa in lieu of the native prince Archelaus. The whole idea rests, of course, on the assumption already mentioned, that the Egyptian fourteen-year census obtained in Syria under Augustus. That has yet to be proved and we must wait for more papyri of the Augustan era. Meanwhile the simple, unstrained and easy coincidences which I have noted seem to deserve attention.

F. HAVERFIELD.

## NOTES AND REPORTS.

ON JUVENAL, *Sat. I. 106*.—Against Mr. Vlachos (*Classical Review*, May), I wish to defend the accepted reading, *purpura maior*, taking up his objections by numbers.

(1). The reference to income rather than to capital or estate means, I believe, 'I am a knight several times over, for five of my taverns alone bring me in the *census* of a knight.' He has already hinted that he might not admit a humble Oriental origin were it not that the *fenestras* rendered denial of such origin useless.

(2). A writer, particularly a poet, must not be expected always to use the conventional adjective. *Purpura maior*, instead of *p. latior*, puts no hard strain either on the Latin or on the reader's comprehension. Besides, Statius uses *maioris clavi*. (Cf. Mayor on the passage.)

(3). A living knight who is rich through his own abilities is better than a (financially) dead ex-senator. 'A sorrow's crown of sorrow is remembering happier things.'

(4). According to Mr. V.'s own theory and showing, any comment by the scholiasts was rather unnecessary. The one who comments on *purpura* by the explanatory word *latioclavius* may easily have meant to explain the unusual adjective. Of course

it would have been more logical and explicit to have mentioned both words. But the remarks of scholiasts are not always as clear or as extensive as could be wished.

Self-made men often worship their maker, and those who have advanced to a higher rank and fortune boast even of humble origin, especially if that origin cannot be concealed.

JOSEPH F. PAXTON.

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA,  
June 3rd, 1900.

\* \* \*

ON JUVENAL, *Sat. I. 106*.—That "*purpura maiorum*," the reading of one MS., supplies a most appropriate sense, Mr. N. P. Vlachos, at page 217 of the current Volume of *The Classical Review*, has I think, satisfactorily, shown; but the *hypermeter* offends me. May not "*maiorum*" have been a gloss on "*aurum*"?—a word which written "*auol*" may also perhaps, as easily as "*maiorum*" written "*maiol*," have been corrupted into "*amor*," i.e. "*amator*," the reading of other MSS.

SAMUEL ALLEN.

6 JUNE, 1900.

\* \* \*

## CAMBRIDGE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

At a meeting held on May 31, 1900, at 4.45 p.m., Mr. J. M. SCHULHOF, Trinity College, was elected a member.

Prof. SKEAT read notes, of which the following is an abstract:—

The phrase *mean it*, in *Merch. Ven.* iii. 5. 52, hitherto unexplained, signifies 'bemoan it, lament it,' or simply, 'lament, sorrow.' We can substitute 'sorrow' without injury to the metre. The *it* occurs as in *foot it*, and similar phrases. Shakespeare has *means* in the same sense elsewhere, *M. N. D.* v. I. 330, and the *M. E. menen*, to lament, is common, being correctly formed from the sb. now spelt 'moan,' with the usual mutation.

The phrase *in the quill*, 2 *Hen.* vi. i. 3, near the beginning, means 'in the coil,' i.e. collectively. *Coil*, Shropshire *quoil*, *quite*, means a heap or collection, and is ultimately a derivative of *L. colligere*. Compare *quoil* for *coil*, *quoil* for *coin*.

*Scotch'd* in *Macb.* iii. 2. 13, is Theobald's correction for *scorch'd*, which happens to be correct, and occurs again in *Com. Errors*, v. 183. *Scotch'd* is a later spelling of the same, and occurs in *Cor.* iv. 5. 198, and in the modern *hopsotch*, for which see the New

Eng. Dict. *Scorch* meant to score upon the surface, as in *The Babees Book*, p. 80, and Wyclif, 3 *Kings*, v. 18; being a derivative of *score*, to incise, and confused with *scorch*, to exhorticate or flay, which is the sense of *O. F. escorcher*.

*Subdue* represents the Anglo-French *subdūt*, originally a past participle; it answers to a Late *L. subdūtus* for *subditus* like Ital. *perduto* for *perditus*. Hence *subdue* is a derivative of *L. subdere*; not, as absurdly said in the dictionaries, of *L. subducere*.

In the A. S. poem entitled *Judith*, l. 47, occurs the curious word *fleohnet*, a fly-net. Warton's *History of English Poetry* rightly explains it by mosquito-net, but wonders how it found its way into the poem. It is a mere translation of *conopeum*; *Judith*, x. 19; xiii. 10 (*Vulgate*). And *conopeum*, as occurring in the very same passages, is the well-known origin of our modern *canopy*, an error for *conopy*.

Dr. POSTGATE read a paper of suggestions upon the text of *Tibullus*.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 295.

## OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

A meeting was held on Friday June 1, at Oriel College.

Mr. E. M. WALKER read a paper upon the Thessalian Expedition of Leotyichides, the object of which was to show that, if the trial and deposition of Leotyichides be assigned to B.C. 469, the winter of 479-8 is the most probable date for his Thessalian expedition. In the first part of the paper an attempt was made to prove that 469 as the year of the deposition follows from the data furnished by the list of Spartan reigns in Diodorus; in the latter part it was sought to be shown that an examination

of the famous story in *Plutarch vita Themist.* ch. 20 rendered the winter after Mycale the only possible period for the expedition.

Mr. G. C. RICHARDS read a paper 'On the Stage of Aeschylus.'

A meeting was held on Friday June 15, at Exeter College.

Mr. L. R. FARNELL read a paper 'On points of topography and religion in Athens, with reference to *Thucydides* ii. 15, and the views of Dr. Dörpfeld,' which will appear in a subsequent number of the *Classical Review*.

## REVIEWS.

CURTZE'S *ANARITIUS ON EUCLID*.

*Anaritii in decem libros priores Elementorum Euclidis commentarii. Ex interpretatione Gherardi Cremonensis in codice Cracoviensi 569 servata edidit MAXIMILIANUS CURTZE, Professor Thoruniensis. Lipsiae in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, MDCCCXCIX. 6 m.*

THE full name of the author of these commentaries was apparently Abū'l 'Abbās al-Faḍl ibn Ḥatīm an-Nairizī. He flourished about 900 A. D. and wrote astronomical works as well as commentaries on the *Syntaxis* of Ptolemy and on Euclid. The commentaries on Euclid were added to a second edition of the *Elements* (shortened and corrected from the first edition) by the first translator of Euclid into Arabic, Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf ibn Maṭar who lived in the time of the Caliphs Ḥārūn ar-Rashīd and al-Mamūn, and whose date may therefore have been about 786-836 A. D. Of this edition of Ḥajjāj the first six Books, with the commentary of an-Nairizī thereon, are preserved in the Codex Leidensis 399, 1, which is being brought out, with a Latin translation, by Besthorn and Heiberg. Only two instalments of this work however (published in 1893 and 1897 respectively) have yet appeared, bringing it no further than to the end of Book I; hence Professor Curtze's edition of the translation by Gherard of Cremona (1114-1187 A.D.) of the commentaries of an-Nairizī, apart from the text of Ḥajjāj, would be welcome even if it merely anticipated the appearance of the rest of Besthorn and Heiberg's edition. But it has a special value of its own in that it includes (1) the commentaries on Books VII-X and also (2) the notes on the first 22 definitions of Book I (corresponding to the first 34 in Simson's edition) which are not found in the Codex Leidensis, several leaves being missing at this point. An-Nairizī included in his notes selections from other writers who had commented on Euclid, and among those from whom he is able to quote extensively are Heron and Simplicius. That Heron wrote a commentary on Euclid is indicated by references to him in Proclus; but we are now able to identify as Heron's much that is given by Proclus without any mention of his name, while at least one extremely interesting note of Heron's (on I. 47) is new, as well as, of course, everything

quoted from his notes on Books later than the first. From the fact that two additions of Heron's to Book VIII are given, it may be inferred that his commentary extended at least as far as that Book. The quotations from Simplicius relate exclusively to the introduction to Book I, the definitions, postulates, and axioms, and particularly postulate 5 (generally known as Axiom 12, or the Axiom of Parallels), in connection with which he gives a full account (purporting to be in its author's own words) of the attempt of Geminus to prove the Postulate by starting from a different definition of parallels. The discussion of this subject by Geminus is one of the most interesting parts of the whole work. The names of Greek writers appear in the Arabic in curious forms. Thus Simplicius is Sambelichius, Archimedes is Aximithes or Asamithes, Heron is Yrinus, Geminus is Aganis. Pappus is referred to in Gherard's translation as 'Quidam,' though Besthorn and Heiberg read Pappus. Other names afford considerable scope for speculation, e.g. 'Heromides' and 'Herundes,' mentioned in the authorities for certain definitions of a point and a line respectively; perhaps Heronas may be meant. 'Aposedanias' can hardly be any one but Posidonius; but 'Abthiniathus' seems to baffle conjecture. The latter is mentioned by Simplicius along with Diodorus as having made another attempt to explain Postulate 5 by means of 'many and various propositions.' Regard being had to the fact that 'p' in Simplicius becomes 'b' and 'd' in Archimedes 'th,' is it a permissible conjecture that 'Abthiniathus' may also represent Posidonius? Proclus tells us expressly of a definition by Posidonius of parallels as 'straight lines in one plane which neither converge nor diverge but have all the perpendiculars drawn from points on one to the other equal'; and he explains that those straight lines which give smaller and smaller perpendiculars in one direction converge in that direction and diverge in the opposite direction. Or can 'Abthiniathus' possibly be *Pitho* of *Antinoeia* whom Serenus of the same place defends, as a friend of his, against those who ridiculed an explanation about parallels contained in a tract which Pitho, not



being satisfied with Euclid's treatment of the subject, wrote thereon? The most interesting extracts from Heron seem to us to be: (1) the alternative proof, with introductory lemma, to I. 19; (2) the lemmas leading up to, and the proof of, the theorem that, in the figure of Eucl. I. 47, if the two acute angles of the right-angled triangle be joined respectively to the opposite corners of the squares on the opposite sides, these straight lines and the perpendicular from the right angle on the hypotenuse of the triangle meet in a point; (3) the alternative proof of III. 10 by means of III. 9, the claim to which by Heron shows that it was interpolated in the text of Euclid; (4) the extension of III. 11 to the case of external contact, which Heron gives as his own, whence it may be inferred that III. 12 was also interpolated; (5) the extension of III. 20 (In a circle the angle at the centre is double of the angle at the circumference standing on the same base) to the case where the angle at the circumference is obtuse and therefore the 'angle' at the centre is greater than two right angles, and the proof, by means of this extension, of the proposition III. 22 (The opposite angles of a quadrilateral inscribed in a circle are together equal to two right angles). It is hardly necessary to say that the 'angle' at the centre in the case referred to is, for Heron, not an angle at all, but is described as the sum of three angles, viz. the angle vertically opposite and therefore equal to the angle subtended at the centre by the arc

of the segment less than a semicircle, and two angles each of which is the supplement of the said angle. The portions of the commentary which are of Arabic origin are not, as it seems to us, so interesting as the extracts from Greek writers; but we may mention that the well-known alternative proof of I. 47, effected by placing the two smaller squares contiguous, with their bases in one straight line, then cutting off two triangles and replacing them in other positions so that they make up the largest square, is given as the discovery of Tābit ibn Kurra (836-901 A.D.). An interesting construction for dividing a straight line into any number of equal parts by once opening the compasses, and by means of Book I. only, may perhaps have been derived from a Greek source, possibly Heron. A very valuable feature, to our mind, of Prof. Curtze's work is the citation of the Euclidean enunciations, not from the Greek text of Heiberg, but according to the version of Campanus from the Arabic as first published by Erhard Ratdolt at Venice in 1482. The version of Campanus shows considerable variations from the Greek text and in many places bears traces of a purer origin, and we are grateful for such considerable quotations from a version otherwise inaccessible to the ordinary reader. Altogether the volume before us is a worthy supplement to the complete edition of Euclid's works by Heiberg and Menge included in Teubner's texts.

T. L. HEATH.

#### PATIN'S POLEMIC OF PARMENIDES AGAINST HERACLITUS.

*Parmenides im Kampfe gegen Heraklit*, von Prof. Dr. A. PATIN (Teubner, 1899). 5 m.

STUDENTS of early Greek philosophy are acquainted with the studies on Herakleitos in which Patin has emphasised a side of the Ephesian doctrine that is apt to be overlooked, the 'Einheitslehre,' which lies behind the war and discord that it uses to explain the world of flux. In his former writings Patin expounded the monism of Herakleitos; he has now turned his attention to the dualism of Parmenides. He does not mean, of course, that Parmenides was really in any sense a dualist. His argument concerns the second part of the poem alone, and he seeks to show that the

view taken of this by Aristotle and Theophrastos is substantially correct. 'In truth,' of course, 'It is,' and we must accept all the consequences of that fact, seeing that it is impossible for our thought to do otherwise. But for all that, the appearance of the world to men is as Herakleitos had described it. There is an illusion—like the Hindu *Mâyâ*—which we cannot escape, and of this an intelligible account can be given, and must be given, even although it can be clearly proved that there is no truth in it at all.

To this it will be objected that it anticipates the Platonic distinction between the *νοητόν* and the *αἰσθητόν*, and it is difficult for us to express the theory except in these



terms. But, Patin argues, the view of Parmenides is not so developed as this. He offers no explanations; he merely states the fact that the world necessarily is one, and just as necessarily appears many. To make it credible that Parmenides intended this, we have only to antedate by a little the distinction of φύσις and νόμος or θέσις. If we do this, a new light is thrown on such lines as—

τοῖς δ' ὄνομ' ἄνθρωποι κατέθεντ', ἐπίσημον  
ἐκάστω

and we can better understand how Empedokles came to say—

νόμῳ δ' ἐπίφημι καὶ αὐτός.

This view of Parmenides, then, stands in sharp contrast to all recent accounts of him. Zeller held that the views expounded in the Δόξα of Parmenides were those of ordinary people. This, however, proved difficult to maintain; for they form a regular cosmological system far removed from everyday opinion. Diels, accordingly, propounded the thesis that the Δόξα was a sort of 'catechism' of the philosophy to which Parmenides was opposed, intended mainly as a school-exercise. Later writers went further and boldly identified the Δόξα with the Pythagorean cosmology. It must be admitted, however, that Patin's arguments have shaken the foundations of this view, and that certain chapters in recent works will have to be re-written.

It is an essential part of the argument before us that Parmenides wrote with Herakleitos in view. Hegel, as is well known, makes Herakleitos come after Parmenides, and Zeller followed this arrangement, though he attached no importance to the question of priority. The chronological evidence is not conclusive; but Patin shows, as I had done, that it is on the whole in favour of the view that Parmenides is of a later date than that commonly given. As he does not appear to have seen what I wrote, the confirmation is all the more striking. He is less successful, I think, in detecting reminiscences of Herakleitos. Those he believes he has found are enumerated on p. 650, and most of them seem to be phrases that any writer might have used. On the other hand, he seems to miss what I still regard as the decisive instance. The παλίντροπος κέλευθος has surely nothing to do with the παλίντροπος (or rather παλάντρος) ἁρμονίῃ, whatever meaning we may give to that. Rather it is poetic diction for the prose ὁδὸς ἄνω κάτω of Herakleitos; and, if so, the allusion cannot be mistaken.

On the whole, despite much that is fanciful, this is a most valuable contribution to the subject, and, along with the *Parmenides* of Diels, makes much that had been written before seem antiquated.

JOHN BURNET.

University of St. Andrews.

#### RIEMANN AND GOELZER'S COMPARISON OF GREEK AND LATIN SYNTAX.

*Grammaire Comparée du Grec et du Latin—Syntaxe*, par O. RIEMANN et H. GOELZER. (Paris, Colin et Cie., 1897) 893 pp. Price 25 francs.

THIS volume bears welcome testimony to the progress which is being made year by year in the direction of the parallel treatment of Greek and Latin syntax, and, it may be added, of the syntax of other languages. As Michel Bréal said of the present volume 'Le seul reproche que nous leurs adressons concerne le titre qu'ils ont adopté. *Grammaire parallèle* du Grec et du Latin eût été une expression plus juste et qui eût mieux indiqué aux lecteurs ce qu'ils ont le droit d'attendre.' Holland has now its *Parallel Grammars* of Greek and Latin by Woltjer (1892 and 1894). The progress of the idea

in Germany is fully set forth in an admirable article by Hornemann in Rein's *Encyclopädisches Handbuch der Pädagogik* (vol. v. 1898, p. 232), where the movement is associated with the names of Vogt, Eichner, Waldeck, Mangold, Harre, Vollbrecht, Heil and Schmidt, Seeger, Hornemann himself, and above all perhaps Banner and Reinhardt, who are now engaged in working out parallel French, Latin and Greek Grammars for the 'Reform-gymnasium' at Frankfurt am Main.<sup>1</sup> As Hornemann points out, the idea was 'at least recognised' by the authorities who

<sup>1</sup> The latest School Greek Grammar published in Germany, that by Weissenfels, has as its central idea a close parallelism of order, terminology, and wording of rules with the Latin Grammar of H. J. Müller.

drew up the Prussian *Lehrpläne* of 1892; at the same time he gives full credit for priority to the English *Parallel Grammar Series* of which the first volume appeared in 1887, as the outcome of the work of the Grammatical Society founded in 1885. Now France has joined in with the present stately volume, which, if not a school book, is yet based on the same idea as the volumes referred to above.

The general execution of the work calls for nothing but praise. The late M. Riemann was known throughout Europe as a distinguished syntactician; and M. Goelzer shows himself in the present volume as a worthy collaborateur. But it would be a poor recognition of the labour bestowed on the present work to dismiss it with a few words of compliment. I have read a considerable part of the work: and if I find myself here and there in disagreement with it, that is only what might have been expected. Scholars who think for themselves on points of grammar can hardly at the present day be in entire agreement on fundamental questions, still less as to details. What appears to me a defect, might be judged by another as a conspicuous merit. With this proviso I will venture to suggest that the parallel treatment might have been more complete if the authors had taken as their basis of classification *meanings* rather than *forms*. The division of Syntax into two parts (called by the Germans *Satzlehre* and *Bedeutungslehre* respectively<sup>1</sup>) is now a commonplace of Grammarians: and my suggestion is that too much prominence is given in the present work to *Bedeutungslehre* as a basis of classification. You cannot, for instance, bring out in clear relief the correspondence of the different kinds of sentences and clauses in Greek and Latin if you group together all those which have the Indicative, and separate off from them those which have the Subjunctive and those which have the Optative; for where the one language uses the Indicative, the other will use the Subjunctive; and so forth. A special difficulty results in the case of the 'past potentials'<sup>2</sup>; being debarred by their scheme

from treating the Latin *crederes*, etc., in connexion with *ἐγώ τις δὲ* (§ 302), the authors are driven to treat it in connexion with the Greek Optative with *δὲ*, to which, as they themselves confess, it does not really correspond in form (see note on p. 334). In fact they have no proper place for it at all. No doubt the justification for this mode of treatment would be that to separate things which are connected in meaning is sometimes necessary, in order to maintain the historical point of view. But a strictly historical point of view is not consistent with parallelism; and parallelism is after all the main object of the authors. Had they been writing a grammar from the point of view of development pure and simple, they would not have resigned the attempt to connect the Latin Imperfect and Pluperfect Subjunctive in Conditional Sentences with some prototype.

While speaking of 'past potentials,' it may be worth while to refer to a passage in the *Introduction* (p. 10) in which the well known difficulty in Georgic I. 320 *f.* is cited in order to castigate certain grammarians for their want of taste. I am not one of the persons referred to; but I venture to think that the authors are ill-advised in their adoption of the emendation of Heyne and Madvig (*ut* for *ita*). 'As if Virgil could have compared the effects of the tempest in spring to what happens in another season!' they exclaim. 'As if Virgil could have used the word *hiems* to denote a summer storm!' I reply. [I say 'summer' not 'spring,' because l. 316 *cum flavis messorum induceret arvis agricola* shows that Virgil is speaking of the time of harvest.] I venture to dwell on this point because, so far as I am aware, it is a new one. And I will go further: is it possible that Virgil can have described by the words *culmumque levem stipulasque volantes* the same thing as he has just before described as *gravidam segetem*? *Gravida seges* is precisely the opposite of *culmus levis* and *stipulae volantes*. My conclusion then is that the MS. reading is quite right; but I do not assent to the impossible explanation of *ita* as *ita ut*, with an *ut* got by some unexplained process of legerdemain out of the preceding *quae* (l. 319). No; the true explanation is a simpler matter. Virgil is describing a summer storm, and he tells us that it was

<sup>1</sup> 'Sentence construction' teaches how meanings are expressed in sentences and parts of sentences: 'the doctrine of meanings' relates to the *meanings of forms*, i.e. the various uses of the inflected forms of words.

<sup>2</sup> In employing this term I do not mean to imply that I accept the idea of 'possibility' as one of the fundamental meanings of the Latin Subjunctive or the Greek Optative with *δὲ*: on the contrary I regard

the 'may' used in translating these moods as representing something different from 'may possibly.' So far I agree with Elmer. I hope to return to the subject hereafter.

so violent that it carried off the *gravidæ seges* as easily as a winter storm would have carried off *culmus levis stipulaeque volantes*: 'just so might a winter storm have carried off light (*i.e.* earless) stalks and flying straw.' None of the commentators that I have ever seen appear to have grasped this interpretation of *ferret* as a past potential. The meaning which results is not 'flat,' it seems to me, but quite natural and effective.<sup>1</sup>

I am not in accord with the authors in thinking it possible to draw a hard and fast line of demarcation between the fundamental meanings of the Subjunctive and the Optative: the former they say, denotes *l'éventualité probable*, the latter *l'éventualité possible*: some such distinction is, no doubt, forced upon the authors by their basis of classification; but all distinctions of the kind lead to *ἀπορίαι*—*e.g.* to what I cannot but regard as the fanciful distinction drawn by Elmer between two senses of *quid faciam* and two senses of *sic agamus*—the sense of 'ought' being connected with the Optative. In regard to a different point I notice a failure of our authors to reap the fruits of Elmer's study; they attempt no rationale as to the use of *μή* in Greek and *non* in Latin 'Deliberative' Questions. Had they entered fully into this line of thought, they would have been led, like Elmer, to constitute a class of 'statements as to what ought to be done' and so to solve the difficulty inherent in the Deliberative Question when regarded as a Command-Question. Is such a thing as an interrogative command conceivable? Regard it in the light of a question as to what *ought to be done* (*i.e.* as corresponding to the kind of *statements* referred to above), and the difficulty vanishes. Instead of such a treatment we find in § 325 the meaningless description that the Subjunctive here expresses 'the emotion which one feels in

putting the question.' The note on p. 329 shows that the subject is not one which the authors have gone into fully. Again the rule given in § 318, 2° ought to have been corrected in the light of Elmer's statistics; it is clear that we can no longer regard *ne feceris* as the normal form of prohibition in Latin. *Hic quaerat quispiam* (with the Subjunctive) is still quoted as coming from the *De Natura Deorum*, but without reference to the chapter and section—a curious concession to recent investigations.

In two or three passages I have noticed a tendency to give a rule without limitations in the large print, followed by a modification of it in small print. I doubt whether this is didactically right. Thus in § 521 we read that *πρίν* may always take an Infinitive and must do so when the principal clause is affirmative; but Remark 1 tells us that *πρίν* in the sense 'until' may take the Indicative even after an affirmative clause. The form of statement might, I think, be modified with advantage. So again in § 304 we read that in Greek a Command is expressed by the Imperative, a Prohibition in the 2nd person by *μή* with the Present Imperative: a Remark below gives the necessary limitation as to the use of the Aorist Subjunctive. But the propositions above ought to have been converted.

The description given in § 407, Remark 1, of the old Latin use of the Indicative in Dependent Questions as a usage of the *langue vulgaire* and an *in correction* is not satisfactory. In the whole of this part of the subject (Dependent Questions) we find nothing in the nature of an attempt to trace the origin and gradual development of this use of the Subjunctive—a fact which is in itself sufficient to show that the work is not to be regarded as an historical grammar properly so called.

But I will not enlarge upon points where this valuable book appears to me open to criticism. It will prove a very useful companion to the scholar and may in the main be fairly described as up to date.

E. A. SONNENSCHN. E.

<sup>1</sup> I speak with a sense of liberation on this line, because I once wanted to write *verrit* for *ferret*—an emendation in which I am happy to say my friend Mr. H. Richards anticipated me in the *Classical Review*.

## LANE'S LATIN GRAMMAR.

*A Latin Grammar for Schools and Colleges.*

By GEORGE M. LANE, Ph. D., LL.D.  
Emeritus Professor in Latin in Harvard University. Harper & Brothers :  
New York and London, 1898. Pp.  
xv. + 572. Price \$1.50.

A BOOK of the size of Lane's *Grammar*—nearly 600 pages—printed in small type and packed with examples, is no small subject for review. This book is known to have been partly in type for several years, and has been eagerly looked for by American scholars, to whom Professor Lane stood as perhaps our very first Latinist. The posthumous issue of his grammar under the editorship of Professor M. H. Morgan—a work of great labour, of real *pietas* from grateful pupil to beloved teacher—is the first opportunity the general public of Latinists has had of coming into contact with Professor Lane's quality. His grammar will now make him many another grateful pupil. My study of it for some weeks in the preparation of this review, has given me at least a sympathy with the merits it displays, though I do not feel myself a competent critic of so ripe a work. Besides, which of us has not some grammar of his youth to which he clings more or less loyally, as they say a certain devout painter kept an ugly little Byzantine Madonna to say his prayers to, even after the time of Raphael?

Nor do I feel it quite possible for any one to reach an impartially critical standpoint. We look into new books to see if they confirm our old beliefs. Horace, as well as another, has pricked this weakness of the critic:

si quaedam nimis antiquæ, si pleraque dure  
dicere credit eos, ignave multa fatetur,  
et sapit et *mecum facit* et love iudicet æquo.

Epis. ii. 1, 66–68.

A Latin grammar is not merely a book, it is a property, always from the publisher's point of view, and sometimes from the compiler's. Professor Lane was not a compiler, and he did not view his grammar as a property. Therefore the book is too unequal as well as too voluminous, I fear, to prove a good property for its exploiters: *absit omen*.

If I may begin with a general weakness, it is the confusion, in the treatment of the

forms, of the comparative (prehistoric) and the historical points of view. Professor Lane, if I read him aright, had in mind to write a historical grammar, but in some way, probably from his interest in quantitative problems, felt constrained to incorporate certain comparative results. His incursions into this domain are, to put it mildly, belated. He talks of *-ē* being shortened in the abl. sg. of consonant stems, of a shortened dat. abl. ending *-ūs*; the voc. *serve* he gets by weakening from *servo*; he goes from *providens* to *prudens* by way of *providens*: *dt* yields *st* in *estis* 'ye eat,' but *ss* in *fossor*: the impv. ending *-mino* has lost an *-s*. There is very much of this sort of thing, and one might cry out with Calverly about 'the brave rhymes of an elder day.' I say this in sorrow, not in flippancy.

Professor Lane nowhere mentions a form not Latin, not even, if I mistake not, an Umbrian or Oscan form. In the syntax, no hint of Greek influence is given, save for the *mihī est cupienti* type. With this method of treatment I have no quarrel, though I should prefer more attention to Greekish idioms, but an author should accept the special limitations of his general attitude. Why mention *n-adulterinum* in anything but a minute study of phonetics? Why print any construct forms like *\*vegħo* *\*magior*? Why specially account for the long *-ō* of *servorum* and say nothing of the *-ō* of *servo*? Wherefore *sum* from *\*esum*, *ea* from *\*ia*, *luxuria* from *luxuries*, *loco* from *\*locuo*?

As a teacher of Latin, I have considered it profitable to teach students but three points of linguistic interest. The 'common' vowels are all explicable by the law of *brevis brevis*, and *bēnē* beside *optimē*; *modō*, *citō* beside *tūtō*, *vērō*; *volō*, *amō* but *cēdō*, *laudō*—such examples prove the case sufficiently.

I teach rhotacism from pairs like *gero*: *gestus*, *oneris*: *onus*, with mention of the double forms like *lares*: *lases*. Our English *was*: *were* pair is also worth mentioning. Professor Lane's treatment of this subject would not make it clear, I fancy, to any one who did not know it already. The third point is the passage of *-t-* to *-ss-*, and this has been well explained by Professor Lane, but without enough insistence on the identity of the *rec-tus* and *quas-sus* types.

The subdivision of 5th declension nouns into two classes seems not likely to prove of any practical pedagogic utility, but the classi-



fication of verbs as I, root-verbs and verbs in -ere, II, verbs in -are, -ere, -ire, is not only 'scientific,' but will perhaps be helpful for purposes of instruction. What uninitiated student, though, would understand why *sero* is put in the (reduplicated) root class? I must believe that the complicated lists of verbs (pp. 146-166) are useless. What is wanted is a simple classification of the various types of irregularity, with a few common verbs to establish each class, and then an alphabetical list of verbs, perhaps apart in a cheap, strong form, like the *Verbi Latini* of the Hoepli manuals.

Professor Lane derives *narrare* from \**gnar-igare* and *nuper* from \**nouomper*. He fails to explain *gratulari* from \**gratitulari*, like *opi-tulari*,—strangely enough, for he very aptly describes haplologia as 'avoidance of a stuttering sound' (126).<sup>1</sup>

What is the basis for classifying -ē in *longē* as a neuter adverbial ending, sometimes shortened, as in *repentē* (705)? We ought to have some justification for the diphthongal -ui of *cui*, instead of the usual and, in my opinion, correct *cui*; and an example for *num* 'now,' which I would gladly accept, granted evidence, is to seek.

What class of readers had Professor Lane in mind when he explains *nobis* as belonging to the *ibī* locative type?

In one at least of the divergences from up-to-date phonetics, viz: in the explanation of the 'juxtaposed' *nolo* and *malo* I must declare my sympathy with Professor Lane's method. Such 'squeezes,'—like our *goodbye* *howdye*, *zounds* etc., Latin *non*, *hercle*, *pol*,—seem to me past control by normal phonetic investigation.

In closing my notice of those sections of the grammar dealing with sounds, structure and forms, it needs to be said how valuable is the material furnished by the lists of inscriptional and early forms annexed to the paradigms; and the teacher of dramatic metres will be grateful for such printing as *rēi rēi* in the paradigms.

I must lament, however, that the grammar has printed potential renderings for the subjunctive paradigms, all the more as Professor Lane here sins against light (see his exhibition of sterling common sense on this point at 717). No wonder the Freshmen in our colleges come up with this misleading association of moods.

Before treating the syntax in detail the general looseness of statement which characterises it may be noted. All scholars know

how hard definition is. Still, to make all the statements about verbs strictly applicable to action verbs only (passim, but see 1587 seq., 1594 seq.), and to include both persons and things under locutions like 'that which' (e.g., 1232, 1255) makes easier writing than understanding. At 721 we read of 'the second person of *what* is spoken to.' What are we to understand by 'the principal cases, which have more complete inflection than the secondary (1112).' Why tell a student that in '*ductori* for a leader . . . -i is the inflection ending meaning for?' Why say (785) 'there are a dozen verbs' in making a statement of an exact number? Who, without previous knowledge or a mental contortion, would understand the meaning of 2334; '*futurum fuisse ut* with the impf. subj. is often used in the passive instead of the fut. pte. with *fuisse*?' Why say a form is not used when it is not in existence (726), or include in a tabular classification members not provided for in the descriptive classification preceding (54 after 51-53)?

The syntax is exceeding full of examples, and these, for all their number, must have been culled with loving care.<sup>2</sup> We see the saving American salt of common sense so often. To teachers of grammar I would recommend 1231: 'But it must be remembered that, as the genitive connects substantives in a loose way, the same construction may sometimes be referred to more than one head.'

Among the many notes I have made in reading the syntax I call attention to the following.

Touching the Accusative: I miss for the cognate type the most telling examples, *nec mortale sonans* (Aen. 6,50) to be followed by *nec vox hominem sonat* (ib. 1, 328),—at least it is my conviction that the more violent instances of an idiom, if from an author read early and by all pupils, should be presented in a grammar. The examples for the Greek accusative might also have included Aen. 2,273 and 1, 228. My impression is, however, that examples from the Aeneid seem to have been avoided by Professor Lane. Either under 1152, or later under the ablv. of measure of difference, the example *milibus passuum sex a Caesaris castris sub monte*

<sup>2</sup> E.g., the contrasting examples in 1056, 1058, and in 1473: at 2075 (Pl. Ep. 116, 331); the fine example for suboblique *quod*, Pl. B. 735 (2319). Only one instance of 'stript' Latin, the jejune *Rhodanus fluit*—cited at 1062, to fix the sentence-type—has been noted.

<sup>1</sup> The references are to sections.



consedit (B.G. 1, 48, 1) ought to be accounted for, especially in contrast with the (O.O.) example *hostes sub monte consedis milia passuum ab ipsius castris octo* (ib. 1, 21, 1). At 1165, we might be told that, before Ovid, *exsequias* occurs only in the instance cited. At 1169 apropos of *celat*, a fine opportunity is neglected of teaching the doctrine of identity in construction of opposites, for *celat* 'hides from' can be explained best as the opposite of *docet*, 'shows to, teaches.' Similarly the *torquem hosti detrahit* type (1209) ought to be explained by the opposition of 'takes away' and 'gives to.' So we should have been spared the association in one rule of this common prose idiom and the sporadic poetical use of the dative with verbs of 'warding off.'

Touching the Dative: We ought to be expressly told somewhere that the dative is a person case. The general treatment of this case is attractive; I refer particularly to the classification into I, Essential Complement, and II, Optional Complement. The explanation of the dative of agent as possessive is specious, I think, and why is the dative of the person viewing or judging dubbed 'Dative of Relation'? If it is worth the while to tell us the construction of *obviam ire*,—and I think it is,—on what principle are we referred to the lexicon for the usage of *consulo*?

Touching the Genitive: Matter pertaining to the objective and subjective uses, and their adjective equivalents, occurs at 1040, 1046, 1232 seq., 1260 seq., but they are compared, and that without any insistence, only at 1227. Contrasted with the admirable clearness of Riemann's treatment (*Syntaxe Latine*,<sup>2</sup> § 48), there is marked pedagogic weakness here. Why is *ad vestram omnium caedem* (1235) given as an example of the apposition of adj. and gen. in subjective relation? Why classify the *summus mons* type under the genitive? § 1273 seems a little loose: 'In poetry and late prose, the gen. is used very freely with many adjectives of various meanings, often merely to indicate what they apply to.' Such a statement I have orally made to my pupils, but the examples here printed hardly justify their separation from § 1264, for *callidior* and *vetus* (cf. *veterator*) are like *peritus*, *maturus* and *serus* not alien to *plenus* and *egenus*. Plautus's *sanus mentis aut animi* is clearly to be explained as his *despiebam mentis*, correctly described at 1339. The discussion of *refert* and *interest* is not satisfying. Without a cross reference back to 816,—and I will say

in passing that a lack of such backward references is a serious mechanical defect of the grammar—the student would be at a loss before *re fert* in Terence. Apropos of the absence of *interest* from early Latin, some notice should have been taken of Plautus's *in remst*, of which *interest* is the semantic legatee,—all the more as there is a tantalizing possibility that *in remst* may have got as far as *in<sup>st</sup>rest* by phonetic process. In 1292, under the heading 'Verbs of Participation and Mastery,' we have the Delphic note that *credo* sometimes takes the dative of the person and the genitive of the thing. The passages, none of which is cited, are Pl. Am. 672, As. 459, 854 (*accredo*), B. 504, Truc. 307. The genitives which occur are *omnium rerum* (As. 459), *duarum rerum* (Truc. l.c), which I regard as genitives of value of the *non huius facio* type; and *divini* (the other places), which is likewise a gen. of value of the *magni aestimat* type. At 1295, we might expect all of 'three or four' examples to be cited, and why are we not told that this gen. of exclamation is Greekish?

Touching the Ablative: 'The abl. with *facio* and *sum* denotes that with which or to which something is done' (1315), but, without insisting that the examples are all of persons, why is the idiom classified as abl. of source, and not rather, like the abl. with *utor*, as instrumental? At 1318, under the abl. of Cause, Influence or Motive: 'the person by whom the action of a passive verb is done, is denoted by the ablative with *ab*.' True enough in fact, however awkwardly put, but we should get a truer explanation by comparing 'There was a man sent from God whose name was John.' In the idiom *oppido, domo recipere*, and in construction with *confusus, fretus* the locative ablative is claimed, incorrectly, I think. The case is not clear for putting the absolute under the abl. of Attendance. The absolute is a composite of many ablative functions (see also Dettweiler in the *Handbuch der Erziehungs- und Unterrichtslehre*, III., p. 88; and Cauer's *Grammatica Militans*, p. 142). At 1379 the explanation of *opus* *chlamyde*, 'there is a job with a cloak, i.e., we need a cloak' is far from convincing. The natural construction of *opus* seems to be retained for us by Plautus (Mo. 412) in the phrase *id videndumst, id viri doctist opus*, and I am fain to believe that *opus* has got its constructions by imitation of *usus*. Might we not expect our grammars to tell us that the futures of *usus* are *usus ueniet* (Poen. 727, S., 475)

and *usus uenerit* (B. 363, Ci., 147, Merc. 518)? To be sure no ablatives occur with these futures. At 1419—20 we ought to be told that *tenuis* with the ablative is probably an encroachment on *fini*,—of absolute origin,—all the more as the rendering of *labrorum tenuis* by 'the length of the lips' so artfully carries with it the doctrine of *tenuis*.

Touching Verb Syntax in General: The description of the relative question *quins* is extremely neat (1505), and the 'Infinitive of Intimation' is a happy rhetorical description of the Historical Infinitive (1535). The subdivision Intermediate Coordinate Sentences presents a not infelicitous name for certain (semi-) paratactic types. At 1701 I miss the telling example *negat quis, nego; ait, aio* (Terence, Eun. 252), and at 1709, beside Plautus's *taceam optimumumst* it might be well to cite Caesar B.G. ii., 10: *constituerunt optimum esse domum...reverti et, quorum in fines primum Romani exercitum introduxissent, ad eos defendendos undique convenient.*<sup>1</sup>

Touching the Subjunctive<sup>2</sup>: Professor Lane's classification (I. Subjunctive in Declarations, with the sub-classes of A. Wish, B., exhortation etc., C. Willingness etc. II. Subjunctive of Action Conceivable) shows rather his individual dislike of accepted terminology than individuality in his treatment, unless indeed the term Action Conceivable betrays an attitude of revolt to the Potential. With this attitude, if I may express my individual skepticism, a skepticism forced upon me from the Latin authors at first hand, I am in hearty sympathy.<sup>3</sup> The potentiality of the subjunctive is, in my opinion, nothing more nor less than the potentiality of the indicative, which Lane presents very fully in §§ 2305—7. The *velim*-types are adequately explained by a theory of attraction from the idea to the mood.<sup>4</sup> On the *dicat, dixerit quis* types I have already expressed an opinion in this *Review* (Vol. xii., 298). The chemical affinity between the subjunctive and 2nd person points to an imperative

origin, for the imperative is the mood of the 2nd person. A definite 2nd person easily becomes gnomic.<sup>5</sup> I have also suggested (above, Vol. xi., 344) that certain exclamatory subjunctives owe their origin to partial obliquity. Here the partial obliquity connotation of the German imperatival auxiliary, *sollen*, furnishes an instructive parallel. The same verb *sollen*, also serves as a potential auxiliary. In Old English also, *sceolde* is common in this sense of German *sollte*.

In the example *sunt item quae appellantur alces* I do not see how *appellentur* could stand (1823), and in Horace's *interdum volgas rectum videt, est ubi peccat* the rhetorical balance of *videt* and *peccat* is the only point to call attention to.

Professor Lane contributes no new light to the *cum*-controversy, and it is something of a shock to be told (1864) that what we have been taught to regard as a typical case,—*cum Athenis essem*,—is exceptional. At 1870 we are not told that *memini cum* also takes the subjunctive. Why is not *vidi cum* with the indic. also mentioned (e.g. Plautus, B. 469)? That *cum* 'since' with the subjunctive is a secondary development seems probable from a consideration of *quoniam*. From the subjunctive in wishes the *qui*-clause may easily have developed, through purpose to tendency and result, whence characteristic; our English infinitive has all these uses. Assuming a similar development for *cum*, the causal use would be subsequent to the characteristic. The concessive use might have originated with a concessive subjunctive in parataxis. The natural propriety of *non* for some of these sentence types would account for its introduction, especially where the positive type was much commoner than the negative (see also Bennett, l.c., pp. 18 seq.) Thus I sketch the aspect to myself of the older views of *cum* and *qui*, which are still to be preferred, in my opinion, to Dittmar's universal polemic solvent.

<sup>5</sup> Bennett's examples of the *videas* type (*Cornell Studies*, ix. 41 seq.) fall into two classes—with transitions: (1) where two verbs balance in relative (conditional) sentences, and (2) in exclamatory sentences, where renderings like 'I'd have you see, I wish you might see,' are very pat. I trust I shall not be understood as objecting to potential renderings for Latin subjunctives where they are obviously convenient, but rather to any tendency to foist upon the primitive limbo of prehistoric syntax, from such scant and scattered evidence, a potential,—in fear lest some subsequent feat of sleight-of-hand and derring-do (may) derive awful consequences for historical syntax.

<sup>1</sup> Another, but in my opinion, less probable explanation is to be seen in most editions. The shift from infinitive to subjunctive (with *ut*) dependencies is not uncommon in Plautus (see Schnoor's 'Zum Gebrauch von *ut* bei Plautus,' footnote 42).

<sup>2</sup> Bréal in his *Commencements du Verbe*, *Mém. Soc. Ling.* vol. xi. 273 seq., presents general points of view for the (Latin) subjunctive of convincing simplicity.

<sup>3</sup> Elmer's remarks on this point (*Cornell Studies*, vi.) have been discussed in this *Review* by the editor (vol. xiii. 66).

<sup>4</sup> See Morris in *Am. Jr. Phil.* xviii. 285.

At 1896 Caesar's use of *quam quo* (B.G. 2 21 3) in a clause of disproportion is deserving of mention as before Livy. Apropos of *ut* 'where' (1936), it would be well to mention, along with the Plautus examples, B.G. 7 46 5, where, though most of the editions fail to state it, *ut* conquieverat may well mean 'where he was napping'.<sup>1</sup> For pedagogic reasons mention should be made in the treatment of parenthetic *ut*, of the example from the Manilian Law, § 20, where *dico* is expressed. At 1968 it was well to give so many instances of explanatory *ut* from Caesar, but the Plautus usage is neglected (e.g. Mo. 27-8).

Touching conditionals: Scholars must be grateful for the 35 pages of examples, though to some of these exception is easy to take. The group labelled apodosis in the perfect (2027) contains four exclamatory perfects, and the remaining apodosis belongs, in my opinion, to the unreal type: the example *iam tum senex erat si senectus verecundos facit* (2028) is an instance, not of a true condition, but of what I will call, for lack of a better name, *si inversum*. In 2075 the example *si hercle haberem pollicerer* is very neatly juxtaposed with *si h. habeam pollicear*,—continued in 2076 by *pol si mihi sit, non pollicear*: *scio, dares*.

Touching the Infinitive: The examples for the purpose construction are numerous and thankworthy. At 2186 the important word *future* is omitted in the discussion of verbs of hoping. The Vergilian example (Aen. 1, 37) of the exclamatory infinitive, even if solitary, deserved mention (2216), and one of the not very numerous Plautine examples, too; and this rule ought to precede the probably paratactic accusative and infinitive after verbs of emotion (2187).<sup>2</sup>

Touching the Gerundive: This form precedes the Gerund, according to the speculations of latter years, and the voice difficulty is beautifully met by translations like 'the occupation of land-tilling' for *studium agri colendi*. The highly instructive example, Cic. ad Fam. 9.25; *nunc ades ad imperandum uel ad parendum potius*; *sic enim antiqui loquebantur*, ought certainly to have been cited (cf. also Sallust,

Jug. 62, 8.) No notice is taken of the gerundive with *est* in the active sense (cf. Brix on Trin. 1159). The explanation of the *vestri adhortandi causa* type by levelling is not bad, but it seems rather forced to account for *istorum adhortandi causa* as due to a subsequent dissociation of *adhortandi* from *vestri*.

Touching the Participle: Cicero was not the earliest author to use the combination of *facit, inducit, videt*, etc. with the present participle in predication (see Tammelin, *de participiis praeclae latinitatis* § 47). Special mention might have been made of the interesting *chlamydem undantem fecit* of Plautus (Ep. 431), as well as of the type *eos laetantis facio* (ib. S. 407).

Touching Oratio Obliqua; § 2231 states the rule for converting an impf. subj. apodosis according to the formula, *esset* becomes *futurum esse*. The case for *futurum fuisse* seems to me the stronger. See Vassiss in the *Revue de Philologie*, XI. 42 seq.; Riemann *Syntaxe Latine*, § 241; Riemann, et Goelzer, *Grammaire Comparée*, etc. p. 616.

Touching Prosody: This excellent chapter is the work of another of Professor Lane's pupils, Professor H. W. Hayley. I miss here a statement of the frequency of the bucolic diaeresis in Horace's hexameters, and wish the rhythmic, if hackneyed, Schiller-Coleridge illustration for the elegiac stanza had been given instead of the harsh verses of Tennyson (2574).

My study of Professor Lane's grammar has left me with a profound regret that he did not write a book on the Comparative Stylistic of Latin and English. When shall we have another scholar so competent to do it? The value of the grammar is great in this regard. Such innovations in terminology as Infinitive of Intimation and Annalistic Present have value for the study of style, rather than for the lower syntax. Examples of 'loose construction,' (1146, 1426, etc.), the massing of constructions possible after verbs of fearing (1959), the remarks on the person range of proper names (1301), on the sphere of collective singulars (1099), on the value of the quicquid, quantum est formulae (1259), with the unfortunate omission of examples from Catullus, who seems to me to have shown a weakness for this idiom, on the rendering of sundry locutions (e.g., 1368, 1966b),—all this has great value for the study of style. Professor Lane would never have countenanced in English that trying locution 'than whom no better ever lived' (cf. 1562). One torment of the class-

<sup>1</sup> See Bryan's *Latin Prose based on Caesar*, p. 73.

<sup>2</sup> This suggestion is at least as old as Barth's *de infin. ap. scen. poetas latinas*, p. 11 (Leipzig, 1881), and has been pressed into service by Dittmar (*l.c.* § 490) for the entire accusative and infinitive construction. The 'Infinitive of Intimation,' with its subject made the object of the verb of saying, might be regarded as a transition stage: see also F. W. Thomas, above, vol. xi. 373 seq.

room will disappear when students learn when to render *neque* by 'but not,' (1445), and *via, parum, minus, male*, etc. by 'not' (1451). It gives comfort to a student of Plautus to know that Professor Lane felt *missa facio* as *dimisi* (1606).<sup>1</sup> The future perfect is now a rapid future (1629) and now a postponed future (1630). Parentheses are asyndetic (1642), though our attention is not called to the forward position of verbs in certain types of asyndeton (2125-6).

The truth seems to be that Professor Lane was dominated by his feeling for style, and his was not a mere theory, but an art of style. The proper translation was all important to him, to such an extent that he says of explanatory *cum* for instance (1874): 'In this use *cum* passes from the meaning of *when* to *that*, *in that*, or *in* or *by* with verbal *in-ing*.' Of course no such change in the meaning of *cum* occurs; what occurs is a change in rendering, to make English and Latin idioms conform. He even gives us comments on his renderings like 'or less clumsily,' and not a few alternative renderings (e.g. 1531, 1571, 1715, 1874).

What a translator of Latin he was. If he had but given us a version of Plautus. His grammar is worth the scholar's perusal if but for his renderings of the examples.<sup>2</sup> Translation is, after all, the greatest thing in the study of language. If our teachers of the classics would take pains to translate well themselves, and to teach this art to their pupils, and not let them pitchfork their Greek or Latin idioms over into impossible uncouth English, then, and not till then, will the future of the classics in the modern scheme of education be assured. I speak, not as a Pharisee, but as a Publican and chief of offenders. The mental exercise of seizing a thought in a complicated foreign dress, divesting it of all its old clothure, and then adorning it anew in our own good English attire, seems to me the best of all training in the use of language; and, as thought has never yet dispensed with language, the best of all training in the processes of thought.

This notice is already overlong, but I am sure I shall be pardoned for adding some examples of Professor Lane's quality as a

translator, and first, of some renderings that seem to me at least to be affected: *persuasit nox* 'the witchery was night' (1066); *postremam aciem* 'rereward line' (1069); *histrio* 'actor man' (1077); *stilus optimus dicendi* magister 'pen is the best, etc.' (1078); *aera per tenerum* 'through lithier sky' (1082); *laborantes* 'sore bestead' (1535); Juv. 10, 22 rendered by 'the poure man when he goth by the weye, before the thevës he may singe and pleye': § 2241 'shill-I-shall-I-ing'; § 2270 'and eke for to be seen'; § 1970, *angusto mari* 'in cramped sea-room,'—reminiscent of Capt. Mahan, perhaps. On the other hand, let us look at the following: *matereula* 'an anxious mother, poor Mamma, dear Mamma'; *lacrimula*, 'a wee tear, a crocodile tear' (269); *bellaria* 'goodies, bonbons' (309); *examussin* 'to a T' (542); *superbio* 'am stuck up'; *iustitia* 'square-dealing'; Horace, Epod. 15, 1: 'twas night, and in a cloudless sky, bright rode the moon amid the lesser lights'; ib. Epis. 1 6 37 'both birth and shape [looks] the almighty dollar gives'; Cicero, Fam. 9 2 1, *at tibi repente, cum minime expectarem, venit ad me Caninius mane* 'but bless you, sir, when I least dreamt of it, who should drop in on me all at once but Caninius, bright and early'; *scyphis pugnare Thracum est* 'to fight with bowls is Vandal work'; *negavit moris esse Graecorum* 'he said it was not manners among the Greeks'; *contentio honorum* 'scramble for office'; *non modo* 'I won't say' (1681); *postulante nescio quo* 'on motion of what's his name'; *fertur* 'tries to charge' (1481). Some of these renderings are beyond most scholars and nearly all pupils, I refer more particularly to the rhyme and verse renderings, but some of them, the manner of some of them, is within the reach of the average, e.g. *præcipit unum omnes peterent Indutiomarum* 'he says they must all concentrate their attack on Indutiomarus.'

I indicate in conclusion a few points that should receive attention in a subsequent edition: The indicative type of deliberative question, occasional in Plautus, and surviving in Virgil (Aen. 4 534) is not mentioned; neither is the *potin ut* type of question. Such idioms as *suavitas verni temporis*, a telling example of which is Aen. 6 238: *tuta lacu nigro nemorumque tenebris*, should be provided for, as well as its contratype, *suaves odores* for *suavitas odorum*.<sup>3</sup> The difficult genitive of Caesar's

<sup>1</sup> I have always explained *exercitum instructum habet* by 'he has his army drawn up,' and *exercitum instructum* by 'he has drawn up his army.'

<sup>2</sup> We have in America no book like Cauer's admirable *Die Kunst des Uebersetzens*, and, so far as I know, there is none in English.

NO. CXXV. VOL. XIV.

<sup>3</sup> Not a quoted example, but representing, I am sure, genuine usage.



quas (sc. naves) sui quisque commodi fecerat is not explained. In 1957 *perdiderimus* is a mistaken measurement, and few will follow Professor Lane in writing *pōntem mōntem*. The last example under 1845 is more simply classified at 1853, and the abl. of route (1376) belongs somewhere after 1377. Misprints are very rare, but *dissimilimus* occurs at 1998. The index, which I have had occasion to use a good deal, is very full and accurate.

I wish in closing to repeat my conviction of the great value of Professor Lane's work for Stylistic teaching, and even more for its actual translations, which exhibit, in an uncommon degree, control of both Latin and English idioms.

EDWIN W. FAY.

AUSTIN,  
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS,  
April 10, 1900.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### THE NEW EDITION OF PAULY'S *ENCYCLOPAEDIA*.

IN No. 1 of the *Classical Review*, 1900, p. 76, Dr. J. E. Sandys writes in a notice of my article 'Die thrakische Chersonesos,' in Vol. III. of Pauly-Wissowa's *Real Encyclopaedia*, Col. 2279:—'We find mention of the speech of Demosthenes on Halonnesus, whereas the extant speech bearing that name is now . . . assigned to Hegesippus, although Demosthenes is known to have taken part in the debate.'

If Dr. Sandys had read the col. 2245 in

my article he would have found that in the twelfth line I have expressly declared that the speech related as a Demosthenic one is of a pseudo-demosthenic origin. Among the chronological data, however, I had to remark that in 343 a speech of Demosthenes was really spoken, of which Libanios expressly says ῥηθείς.

DR. L. BÜCHNER.

MUNICH, June 16th, 1900.

## VERSIONS.

### AN IDYLL IN ENGLISH AND GREEK.

O WHAT a pain is love! how shall I bear it?  
She will inconstant prove, I greatly fear it.  
She so torments my mind that my strength  
faileth,

And wavers with the wind as a ship saileth:  
Please her the best I may, she loves still to  
gainsay:

Alack and well-a-day! Phillada flouts me.

At the fair yesterday she did pass by me,  
She looked another way and would not spy  
me:

I woo'd her for to dine, but could not get  
her;

Will had her to the wine—he might intreat  
her,

With Daniel she did dance, on me she looked  
askance,

Oh! thrice unhappy chance; Phillada flouts  
me.

Fair maid! be not so coy, do not disdain me!  
I am my mother's joy; sweet! entertain me!

ἃ δυσέρως μὲν ἔρως πῶς μιν φέρω; ἃ Γαλάτεια  
μή τι παλιντράπελος δίδω μάλα· νῦν ἀνιὰ γὰρ  
οἷστρω θυμὸν ἐμὸν καὶ τὸ σθένος ἐξαλαπάσδει.  
εἰκὴ ναὺς τις ὅπως φέρομαι πνοαῖσι θαλάσσης.  
σαίνω γ' ὅτι μάλιστα· τί δὲ πλέον; οὐδέχεται  
δῆ.

φεῦ κακοδαμονίας. τῇ δ' οὐ μέλει, οὐ μὰ Δι'  
οὐδέν.

χθιζὴ μὲν παρέβα με πανηγύρει ἀντιάσασα  
οὐδ' ἔθελεν ποθορῆμεν· ἐπεὶ δ' ἐκάλεν ποτὶ  
δέπνον

ἔπτυσ' ἀναιγνύμενα, ξείνιξε δέ μιν Διοκλείδας  
οὐκ ἀέκοισαν ἐκὼν· ἃ δ' αὖ Δανάου προκαλεῖν-  
τος

ὀρχεῖται κῆμ' εἶδε τάλαν τάλαν ὀμμασι λοξοῖς·  
φεῦ κακοδαμονίας· τῇ δ' οὐ μέλει οὐ μὰ Δι'  
οὐδέν.

μή τὸν τόσον χαρίεσσα κόρα διαθρύπτει, μή μιν  
ᾤδε καταφρονέοις· τὰς ματρός γ' εὐχομαι ἦμεν  
χάρμα· τὴ δ' ὦ μέλιτος γλυκερωτέρα, αἰθ' ἀτιτάλ-  
λοις

καὶ τὰ τὸν φιλέονθ'· ἃ γὰρ τοι ἐπὶ θάνη εὐθὺς



She'll give me when she dies all that is fitting;  
Her poultry and her bees, and her goose sitting,  
A pair of mattress beds, and a bag full of shreds;  
And yet, for all this guedes, Phillada flouts me.

She hath a clout of mine, wrought with blue Coventry,  
Which she keeps for a sign of my fidelity;  
But, faith, if she flinch, she shall not wear it;  
To Tib, my t'other wench, I mean to bear it.  
And yet it grieves my heart so soon from her to part;  
Death strike me with his dart! Phillada flouts me.

Thou shalt eat crudded cream all the year lasting,  
And drink the crystal stream pleasant in tasting,  
Whig and whey whilst thou lust, and ramble-berries,  
Pie-lid and pastry crust, pears, plums and cherries;  
Thy raiment shall be thin, made of a weevil's skin—  
Yet all's not worth a pin: Phillada flouts me.

Fair maiden! have a care, and in time take me;  
I can have those as fair, if thou forsake me:  
For Doll the dairy-maid laughed at me lately,  
And wanton Winifred favours me greatly.  
One throws milk on my clothes, t'other plays with my nose:  
What wanting signs are those! Phillada flouts me.

I cannot work nor sleep at all in season:  
Love wounds my heart so deep, without all reason.

I gin to pine away in my love's shadow,  
Like as a fat beast may penned in a meadow.  
I shall be dead, I fear, within this thousand year:  
And for all that my dear Phillada flouts me.

ANON.

δωσέῃ ἐμὴν πάνθ' ὅσσα πρέπει, κῶρνίγια πολλὰ  
χῆνά τ' ἐπ' ὥζοισαν τραφεράν, δωσέῃ δὲ μελίσσας  
οὐκ ὀλίγας· παρ' ἐμὴν δὲ δύο στιβάδες παράκειν-  
ται,

ἔστι δὲ καὶ σάκκος πέπλων τ' ἀποτίλματα,  
πλούτω

θησαυρός· τᾷ δ' οὐ τήνων μέλει οὐ μὰ Δί' οὐδέν.  
ῥάγος ἔχει τι λαβοῖσ' ἀπ' ἐμεῦ πολυποίκιλον  
ῥῶλον

πορφυρέον, τὸ δ' ἔχουσα λέγει μέγα φίλτρον  
ἔρωτος

τῷ μὲν ἔχειν· ἀλλ' αἶ κ' ἀπατᾷ με, κακαὶ φρένες,  
ἢ μὲν

οὔτι φορησέῃ τήνω, βία δ' Ἀμαρυλλίδι δωσῶ  
ἀρπάξας, ἐπεὶ ἔσθ' ἑτέραν τοι ἀμέλγειν· ὁμῶς δὲ  
λυπεῖ τὰν κραδίαν με διαζευχθῆμεν ἀπ' αὐτᾶς  
ὡς ταχέως· αἰθ' ὦν ταχέως κατατοξευθεῖν  
τῷ θανάτῳ βέλει· τᾷ δ' οὐ μέλει οὐ μὰ Δί'  
οὐδέν.

τοῦτ' ἐπ' ἡτέανον πακτὰν παρέχοιμί κ' ἔδωδ' ἄν·  
ἔστιν ψυχρὸν ὕδωρ, ποτὸν ἀμβρόσιον παρὰ  
κράνας,

ἔστ' ὁρὸς αἶ κ' ἐθέλης, ἔστ' ἄμιελος ἂ γλυκύκαρ-  
πος,

ἐντ' ὀγχναὶ μαλακαὶ βράβυλοι τε καὶ ἄλλα  
ὄπωρα,

πὰρ πέλανοι κείνται παντοῖοι ἐπὶ πλαθάνοισιν,  
εἴμα μάλα λεπτὸν περιέσσεται, οἷον ἀράχνης·  
πάντα μάταν· τᾷ δ' οὐ τήνων μέλει οὐ μὰ Δί'  
οὐδέν.

φράζεο δ' ὥς βέντιστα· τί μ' οὐκ ἔφθασσας  
ἀκοίταν

δεξαμένα; Γαλάτειαν ἴσως καὶ καλλίον' ἄλλαν  
εὐρησῶ· καὶ γὰρ Δολιὰς μ' ἐγέλασεν ἰδοῖσα  
πρᾶν ποκα, χά Κλεαρίστα ἐμὴν χάριν οὐκ ἀνα-  
νέει·

ἀ μὲν ἐπιρρίπτει χλαῖνα γάλα, χά Κλεαρίστα  
μόσχῳ γαυροτέρα ψῆ μοι τὰν ῥίνα, φιλεῖ δὲ  
συμπαῖσδεν παῖσδοντι· τὰ δ' οὐ τεκμήρια πολλὰς  
ἔστι φιλοφροσύνας; τᾷ δ' οὐ μέλει οὐ μὰ Δί'  
οὐδέν.

οὐκέτι τοῖς ἀγροῖς ἐργάζομαι, οὐκέτι κνώσσω·  
κεντεῖ ἔρως κραδίαν· πᾶ τὰς φρένας ἐκπεπότα-  
μαι;

τάκομαι οἶμοι ἐγών, κατατάκομαι ἀεροφόιτας  
βῶς ἐνὶ κάπῳ ὅπως εὐερκεῖ, καὶ μάλα δεῖδω  
μή τι κίχη θανάτός με τριακοσίων ἐνιαυτῶν·  
ὦ γλυκερὰ Γαλάτεια, τί τιν μέλει; οὐ μὰ Δί'  
οὐδέν.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

## ARCHAEOLOGY.

HUTTON'S GREEK TERRACOTTA  
STATUETTES.

*Greek Terracotta Statuettes*, by C. A. HUTTON.  
Seeley and Co., 1899. Pp. xvi. + 80.  
Price 7s.

It is remarkable that, till quite recent years, archaeologists should have so generally neglected the study of Greek terracotta statuettes. The products of the koroplast, while most closely connected with Greek Art as displayed in sculpture and painting, like the designs of the vase-maker, throw a brighter light than either of these major arts on the life and thought of the generality of the Hellenic people. It is nevertheless a fact that, till almost a quarter of a century ago, no particular attention was bestowed on the interesting and beautiful figurines which are associated in the minds of most with the name of Tanagra. As early as 1840 Greek terracotta statuettes began to find their way from Asia Minor to the European Museums, but it was not till 1875 that the Greek Archaeological Society was tempted by the numerous finds which had been made by unauthorized diggers at Skimitari (Tanagra,) to undertake anything of the nature of a systematic excavation in search of terracottas; and not till 1880 that the careful and Scientific excavations conducted by MM. Pottier and Reinach at Myrina roused archaeologists to the appreciation of the importance of terracottas in the study of Greek art and thought.

Without doubt many valuable data and many interesting examples, especially of primitive art, have been irrecoverably lost in consequence of this unfortunate absence of scientific exploration; but under the more favourable conditions which exist to-day each succeeding year adds its quota to our knowledge of the subject. The earlier months of the year 1899, which witnessed the third excavation on the site of Naukratis (undertaken this time by the British School at Athens under the direction of Mr. D. G. Hogarth), have made the latest considerable addition to our specimens and data; and the autumn of the same year gave us Miss C. A. Hutton's *Greek Terracotta Statuettes*, which, with a useful chapter in Dr. Murray's Handbook of Greek Archaeology, may claim to have made almost the first attempt to increase the knowledge

and interest of English Archaeologists in a subject to the study of which Heuzey, Furtwaengler, Hoffmann, Kekule, Pottier, Reinach, and others have devoted their attention and genius in France and Germany.

Miss Hutton's book, which is prefaced by a few paragraphs from the pen of Dr. Murray, deals with Greek statuettes chiefly from an artistic standpoint. At the same time it contains much that is of use and interest to those who regard terracottas from the classical and archaeological rather than from the aesthetic point of view. Perhaps the most useful chapter in the book is that which discusses ably and concisely the methods of manufacture: the earliest process of modelling by hand; the use of a stamp to emboss the face or the front of a figure upon a solid lump of clay; and, finally, the employment of one or more moulds. Miss Hutton justly says: 'Our admiration for these statuettes is only increased by a knowledge of the simple methods used in their production.' Even in the heyday of the art the koroplast seems to have possessed no great assortment of moulds. Such variety as he desired he produced by the judicious combination of a few moulds, and by skilfully retouching his figure after the various moulded parts had been joined together.

A chapter which treats of the use and meaning of the Statuettes is, in the writer's opinion, less successful, but it is perhaps better to refrain from discussing a question which is at present so uncertain. Where so much can be said in support of rival views it is difficult and perhaps rash to choose between them. Miss Hutton may or may not be right in arguing that, as Pompeian houses have been found to contain terracottas resembling those discovered in Pompeian tombs, Greek houses contain terracottas similar to those which have been unearthed in tombs at Myrina, Tanagra, and elsewhere. The weak point in the argument is the fact that Pompeii was not essentially a Greek town. With regard to the so-called masks or half-figures, Miss Hutton, with other writers, is perhaps too ready to assign a funerary significance to them considering that, at any rate at Naukratis, they have been discovered among temple dedications to Aphrodite. It will be interesting to see the attitude taken by Mr. H. B. Walters with respect

to this subject in his forthcoming catalogue of the terracottas in the British Museum.

Certainly Miss Hutton seems rash in writing (in a chapter on Archaic Statuettes) of 'a feminine divinity whose presence in the tomb was due to a desire to protect the dead from evil influences, but *who at this period* (down to the end of the fifth century) *had neither a special name, nor any very definite functions*;' and again in stating that the female statuettes 'when found in tombs have a natural reference to the under-world character of the goddess-mother and her power of protection there, as in the upper world, therefore in time they are connected with the goddess Demêter, who as Earth-mother had always such functions, but who became more particularly the under-world goddess, when the legend of the rape of Persephonê and her sway among the dead as the bride of Hades had been shaped into words. In time the two goddesses ousted all other divinities from the under-world cycle, and endowed with their own personality not only the feminine statuettes, but also the female masks (*oscilla*) which were hung on the walls of the tombs.' Scarcely more convincing is the assertion as an undisputed fact that these female half-figures 'are derived from the Egyptian coffins, the upper part of which is moulded in the likeness of the head and shoulders of the dead.'

The remainder of the book gives a bright and interesting account of the development from the archaic statuettes of the genre figurines which are most likely to appeal to the 'wider public' for whom Miss Hutton writes. The narrative is enlivened with appropriate, and some inappropriate, quotations from the Greek Anthology, though the English versions given do not always display as much accuracy in translation or in rhythm as could be desired. There is a tendency (especially marked in the last two chapters) to wander somewhat too widely from the subject in hand, and many of the by-paths, into which Miss Hutton would have us follow her, cannot be said to lead us much closer to an appreciation of Greek terracotta statuettes. Miss Hutton might with advantage have given references for her quotations and allusions on pp. 35, 36, 55, 56. Her book is profusely and beautifully illustrated and many of the reproductions are done in colour.

To advert briefly in conclusion to the results of the Naukratis excavation:—of the four hundred terracottas discovered, the majority were of late date (150 B.C.—

150 A.D.) and local manufacture. These appeared to be connected with the worship of Horos and were mostly of types already known to English students through specimens from the Fayûm now in the British Museum. They were derived apparently from the dwelling houses of the later inhabitants of Naukratis. A few animals and figures of rude workmanship and primitive appearance—probably toys—were recovered from the uppermost stratum of the soil, and their presence here shows the danger of assigning all primitive figures of horsemen, etc., to an early date when their exact provenance is unknown.

The earlier heads and figures were, to judge both from their types and from the inscribed sherds found with them, dedications to purely Hellenic divinities. They consisted of a number of heads of 'Tanagra' type (c. 200 B.C.), which have been connected, in consequence of an inscription found with them, with the worship of Demeter and Persephone; some six specimens which were probably dedicated to Rhea; and several heads, many of unusual size, which have been classed, in consequence of inscriptions unearthed with them, as dedications to Aphrodite. These date from the beginning of the sixth century to the end of the fourth or even later, and in some cases exhibit considerable artistic merit and originality:—one or two are, so far as I am aware, unique as regards both conception and execution:—others are 'body-figures' of the kind already alluded to in the notice of Miss Hutton's book. Of these latter one only<sup>1</sup> is of native clay, whilst of the former perhaps half-a-dozen were made in Naukratis. It is interesting to note that the figures of Naukratite make date back to circa 500 B.C.; and that those of foreign (? Rhodian or Cypriote) manufacture are rare after the beginning of the fourth century B.C.

CLEMENT GUTCH.

#### THE FOUR GREAT AQUEDUCTS OF ANCIENT ROME.

THE bulk of the water with which ancient Rome was supplied came from the upper valley of the Anio, and was carried by four aqueducts, two of which, the Anio Vetus and the Anio Novus, drew from the river itself, while the other two, the Marcia and

<sup>1</sup> An argument, perhaps, against the Egyptian origin of '*oscilla*' asserted by Miss Hutton.

the Claudia, were supplied by springs near Arsoli, which are now once more in use. These aqueducts were constructed at different periods, the Anio Vetus in 272 B.C., the Marcia in 144 B.C. while the Claudia and the Anio Novus dated from 52 A.D. But all follow, in the main, the same line, the Claudia and Anio Novus generally keeping very close together. Their course from their sources to Rome may be divided into three sections. The first—through the Anio valley as far as Tivoli—is well known in the main, though further search has revealed the existence of many hitherto undiscovered remains. And even better known is the last section which begins at Capannelle where the aqueducts finally emerge from their subterranean course, and extend right up to the walls of Rome.

But from Tivoli to the level of the Campagna at Le Capannelle is a drop of three or four hundred feet, and, in order to make their descent sufficiently gradual the aqueducts sweep round, first through the difficult hills and gorges near Gallicano, and then along the lower northern slopes of the Alban Hills. This section of their course is fairly well known as far as Ponte Lupo, the finest of all the aqueduct bridges, in which the four unite to cross a deep ravine; but (with the exception of some remains near S. Maria di Cavamonte, in close proximity to the Ponte Amato of the Via Praenestina, the existence of which was known only from the indications given by Fabretti) the aqueducts have always been considered to be practically lost from Ponte Lupo until their reappearance at Le Capannelle. With the aid of Professor Lanciani, I have been attempting to fill up this gap in their course during the last two seasons. I have now ascertained at least the line of the Anio Novus, the highest in level of all, and I venture a preliminary account of the results. A detailed description will, I hope, appear some day with the co-operation of my friend Mr. Howard Crosby Butler. Meantime I may remark that the remains of the aqueducts round Gallicano well deserve a visit from any scholar who cares to go a little out of the beaten track. The Ponte Tanotella, N.W. of Gallicano, has been described by Prof. Lanciani in the *Bullettino Comunale* for 1899: in addition to this there are interesting remains near the Mola di Gallicano and at Cavamonte. A few hundred yards west of S. Maria di Cavamonte a long piece of the Anio Novus, carried on substructures, is seen; and about

half a mile further west, at a point where the Italian Staff Map marks 'Ponte Diruto,' are two fine bridges belonging to the Claudia and Anio Novus, with traces of the aqueduct of the Marcia. A mile further west again, over the east branch of the stream called Fosso di Biserano, are three smaller bridges, the two lower of which, in *opus quadratum*, are wonderfully well preserved. At the Laghetto della Pallavicina the Anio Novus appears again with a long substructure with buttresses, and again to the S.W. of the farmhouse. It now turns sharply south, but after crossing the modern Via Labicana turns west again; and both it and the Aqua Claudia are seen crossing a small stream west of the Casale delle Marmorelle.

The Anio Vetus meanwhile, which runs at a considerably lower level, is almost entirely untraceable until a point just south of the springs of the Aqua Felice. Here it appears running at the ground level, and can be followed for over a mile, keeping round the north and west slopes of Monte Falcone, in order to avoid tunnelling through the hard silex, which here comes up to the surface. It is easily traceable right up to the high road, and again in two places beyond it, but after this it seems to disappear entirely.

In the next valley to the W.—the E. branch of that which runs along the W. side of the Colle della Lite—considerable remains of both the Anio Novus and the Claudia, carried upon substructions exist while considerably further north are the remains of a small bridge of the Marcia: and beyond this the aqueducts are clearly traceable by the enormous amount of deposit which was thrown out of the channel at the putei, and which the continual spread of cultivation brings to light. The structural remains are, however, from this point onwards, quite insignificant, as the country is no longer difficult to negotiate. In consequence of this fact, the Marcia also becomes difficult to trace, and I have not yet been able to follow it further.

The Claudia and Anio Novus, keeping, as they usually do, very close together, cross the basin of Prata Porci (their bridges are visible in the stream which runs through the centre), and then reappear in the E. branch of the Valle della Morte, where the stream runs through the specus of the Claudia. In the W. branch of the same valley, just N. of the Fontanile Trasanella, is a small bridge of the Anio Novus. The aqueducts then tunnelled through the E. bank of the



crater of Pantano Secco, and ran along its E. and S. sides at some height above the bottom of the crater,—another proof that the crater was a lake in Roman times—and very probably the Lake Regillus (see my article in *Classical Review* Dec. 1898 p. 470). Thence they ran W.S.W., crossing the Via Cavona (an ancient diverticulum of great importance) precisely where the boundary of the Agro Romano crosses it—a coincidence which more than once occurs—and then cross the Via Tuscolana close to the Fontanile di Vermicino. Further remains—fragments of the specus and several putei—are traceable as far as the tunnel of the Marrana Mariana (or Marrana di S. Giovanni) which is neither more nor less than the specus of the Aqua Claudia traversing the hill; the very putei are the ancient putei, though the intervals are slightly irregular. The Anio Novus had a parallel tunnel slightly further to the N.

The aqueducts follow the line of the Marrana for a considerable way—until the disused line of the Naples railway is reached—and then turning slightly northward, proceed to the Bertone property, where in 1884 the specus of both aqueducts and piscina of the Anio Novus, were discovered (see Lanciani *Notizie degli Scavi*, 1884 p. 155). Here begins the well-known long line of arches, which runs right up to the Porta Maggiore, the splendid double arch by which the Claudia and Anio Novus are carried across the Via Labicana and the Via Praenestina just after their separation, and which Aurelian used as a gate in the line of his walls.

THOMAS ASHBY, JUN.

ROME, May, 1900.

#### HERSCHEL'S *FRONTINUS*.

*The Two Books on the Water Supply of the City of Rome of Sextus Julius Frontinus* . . . by CLEMENS HERSCHEL, Hydraulic Engineer. Boston: David Estes & Company. 1899. \$6.50. Pp. xxvi, 296.

It is just twenty years since Prof. Lanciani published his admirable monograph 'I comentarii di Frontino,' in the four hundred quarto pages of which he dealt in detail with the aqueducts of ancient Rome and the tract of Frontinus concerning them. His book was intended for scholars and is still the best work on its subject which a scholar could consult, though recent discoveries may make one wish for a second edition. Mr.

Herschel's volume, now before me, is a very different work. Externally a handsome quarto, not seriously smaller in size than its Italian predecessor, it is in reality a much shorter work and much more popular in character. Its contents are somewhat miscellaneous. It opens with a photographic reproduction of the Monte Cassino MS., the only important manuscript of Frontinus. I have no means of comparing this reproduction with the original, but it looks to be successful, and scholars will doubtless welcome it as an addition to the number of Facsimiles of manuscripts. Then follows the text of Frontinus with an English translation on the opposite page. The translation was made on a curious plan. Mr. Herschel frankly avows in his preface that he is not a Latin scholar. He therefore took French and German translations of Frontinus: where they agree, he accepted the result, and where they differed, he consulted Latin scholars. It sounds an odd method, but I must confess that I have no particular fault to find with the translation which it has produced. The rest of the volume, about two hundred pages of large print, copiously interspersed with illustrations, contains 'explanatory chapters' on the life of Frontinus, and various questions of water supply. These chapters are addressed principally to those for whom the English translation is intended. They do not confine themselves to the Roman aqueducts or even to questions of ancient waterworks: a short chapter discusses the hydraulics of Galileo and Leonardo de Vinci. Nor do they go greatly into detail: very little is said about the course of the aqueducts from the hills to Rome. Nor are they free from errors. But where Mr. Herschel writes as a hydraulic engineer, he seems to me in my total ignorance of hydraulics, to write well and valuably, and certainly he writes interestingly. I may quote one view of his which, whether right or wrong, is novel to me. Every one who has seen the ruined aqueducts in the Campagna, must have noticed the brick arches which have been inserted inside the original stone arches of the Claudia and one or two other aqueducts. This brickwork is usually explained as built to support the aqueduct, and the explanation has suggested inferences to the discredit of Roman masonry. Mr. Herschel has a different theory. He points out that, all the world over, stone aqueducts tend very quickly to leak, from no other reason than the mere expansion of the stone in hot summers and its contraction in the winters.



Accordingly, he supposes the brickwork of the Roman aqueducts to have been clumsy attempts to stop leaks from the outside.

F. HAVERFIELD.

D'ARBOIS DE JUBAINVILLE'S  
CELTIC AND  
HOMERIC CIVILISATIONS.

*La Civilisation des Celtes et celle de l'Épopée Homérique.* Par H. D'ARBOIS DE JUBAINVILLE, Membre de l'Institut. Paris, Ancienne Librairie Thorin et Fils, A. Fontemoing éditeur. 1899. In 8vo. Pp. xv., 418. Price 8 francs.

THE book before us forms vol. vi. of a general series entitled *Cours de Littérature Celtique*, edited by d'Arbois de Jubainville with the collaboration of well-known Celtic scholars. Vol. i. is a general introduction to the study of Celtic literature, vol. ii. is devoted to Celtic mythology, vols. iii., iv. are taken up with translations of the Welsh romances known as the Mabinogion, vol. v. deals with the Irish epic tales, and the translations it contains are extremely valuable as illustrations of the Celtic side of the arguments in the sixth volume. In the preface to the present work, the writer takes the reader into his confidence and thus describes the genesis of his book: 'Une étude grammaticale, entreprise il y a deux ans, m'a fait parcourir les premiers livres de l'*Iliade*: je voulais y recueillir des exemples de *tmèse* analogues à ceux que nous offre le vieil irlandais . . . Je connaissais fort mal la littérature homérique, dont je m'étais très peu occupé depuis ma sortie du collège, c'est-à-dire depuis plus de cinquante ans. Recommencant à lire Homère, j'ai été surpris des nombreuses ressemblances que la civilisation décrite dans l'*Iliade* et l'*Odyssée* offre avec celle que nous dépeignent les auteurs grecs et latins quand ils nous montrent ce qu'étaient les Celtes indépendants pendant les trois premiers siècles qui ont précédé l'ère chrétienne, et plus tard, pendant toute la durée de l'empire romain d'Occident. Que dis-je? Même après la chute de cet empire, la plus ancienne littérature de l'Irlande nous offre encore le tableau de la même civilisation dans cette île au commencement du moyen âge' (pp. ix., x). At the end of the book he sums up as follows: 'Les Gaulois, pendant les trois siècles qui ont précédé notre ère, les Irlandais,

tels que nous les dépeint leur littérature épique la plus ancienne, mise par écrit dans le moyen âge, étaient à peu près au même degré de civilisation que les Grecs et les Troyens de l'épopée homérique environ huit cents ans avant Jésus-Christ' (p. 395).

M. d'Arbois has succeeded in producing a very interesting book on quite a new subject; indeed with the materials at his disposal, he could not easily have failed to do so. All scholars now agree in assigning to the Celtic languages and literatures the importance they really deserve in the history of Indo-Germanic philology, civilisation, and mythology. Much has been written on Celtic grammar and folk-lore, but this is the first attempt to bring Greek and Celt side by side and compare in detail their ways and customs. Our authorities on the early Celts fall naturally into two distinct groups: (1) Greek and Roman writers, beginning with the third century B.C.; their information refers almost exclusively to the Gauls and Britons: (2) the oldest Irish legends and sagas. This second source, though far later in date than most of our classical authorities, is the most important for our present purpose. Considerable information may, with careful sifting, be also gathered from early Welsh literature, as the Mabinogion and the Lives of the Saints. It is somewhat surprising that M. d'Arbois has not made more use of early Welsh writings, from which many an interesting parallel might have been supplied, where an Irish one is wanting. Although the oldest extant Irish MS.<sup>1</sup> containing epic stories was written as late as the year 1100 (circa), the *origin* of these old tales is to be sought in pagan Ireland long before the coming of Patrick and the Gospel. Originally the legends were out-and-out pagan and 'brutal' in tone, though by no means lacking in a certain sense of chivalry and tenderness of thought. With the introduction of Christianity, the coarser parts were either toned down or rigidly suppressed; Christian interpolations were made, and by judicious 'editing' on the part of monastic scribes the old epic became an incongruous mixture of pagan and Christian ideas; but even in the late form we possess it is by no means difficult to separate the different parts, as the monks contented themselves with superficial changes and did not trouble themselves about scrupulous consistency; Christian connections being found for the heathen heroes, the latter were allowed

<sup>1</sup> The *Book of the Dun Cow*, *Lebar na huidre*, published in facs. by the Royal Irish Academy, 1870.

to retain their character of cruel and savage fighting-men.<sup>1</sup>

The following is a summary of the main parts of d'Arbois' book:—

*Chapter I. Observations préliminaires.* One important point of contrast in the two civilisations is due to a difference of date, viz., in Homeric society the use of iron is quite exceptional, among the Celts it is very common. One point of resemblance is noticed by Diodorus Siculus (v. 28):—

Τοὺς δ' ἀγαθοὺς ἄνδρας ταῖς καλλίσταις τῶν κρεῶν μοίραις γεραίρουσι [Κελτοί], καθάπερ ὁ ποιητὴς τὸν Αἴαντα παρεισάγει τιμώμενον ὑπὸ τῶν ἄριστῶν ὅτε πρὸς Ἑκτορα μονομαχήσας ἐνίκησε,

‘Νότοισιν δ' Αἴαντα διηνεκέσσει γέρας.’<sup>2</sup>

Then come examples of duels between warriors of opposing armies from Homer,

<sup>1</sup> Our store of Irish epic literature is rich and varied: much has been published and translated, and more still remains untouched. Facsimiles of the most important MS. collections have been published by the R. Ir. Acad., e.g. Book of Leinster, Book of Lecan; editions of texts with translations, notes, and discussions, may be seen in *La Revue Celtique* (Paris), Meyer and Stern's *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie* (Halle, Niemeyer; London, Nutt), and Windisch and Stokes's *Irische Texte*, several series (Leipzig, Hirzel). The following deal fully with an important branch of the Irish epic: *The Cuchullin Saga* (1898, Nutt), with an introduction by Miss Eleanor Hull, who acts as editor, and translations from the Irish by eminent Celtic scholars, *The Feast of Bricriu* [the ‘poison-tongued,’ the Irish Thersites], edited and translated by G. Henderson, M.A., Ph.D. (1900, Irish Texts Society). The most complete list of MSS. containing epic tales is d'Arbois de Jubainville's *Essai d'un Catalogue de la Littérature épique de l'Irlande* (Paris, Thorin, 1883). To classical students the following short list of Irish versions of Greek and Latin classics may be of some interest:—

*The Odyssey*.—Merugud Uilix (Book of Ballymote = B.B. end of 14th cent.), edited by Kuno Meyer. (Nutt.)

*The Aeneid* (B.B.).—Books I.–IV., edited with Eng. trans. by T. Hudson Williams in *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, II. Band, 3 Heft.

*The Destruction of Troy* (Dares Phrygius).—Numerous versions exist, e.g. Book of Leinster (12th cent.), B.B., Trin. Coll. H. 2, 17 (14th cent. ?), edited with Eng. trans. by Whitley Stokes in *Irische Texte* ii. 1. One of the many Welsh versions is published in Rhys and Evans's *Red Book of Hergest* (14th cent.), Vol. II. (Oxford, 1890).

*The History of Alexander the Great* (after Orosius).—In the Lebar Brecc (end 14th cent.) and B.B.; edited, with Germ. trans., by Kuno Meyer in *Ir. Texte*, ii. 2.

*Lucan's Pharsalia*.—Cath Catharda, in Stowe MS. No. 992 (14th or 15th cent.).

<sup>2</sup> The contest for this ‘hero's-portion’ forms the subject of some of the most popular Irish romances; one of the most important is translated in *Cours de Litt. Celt.* v. pp. 80–148, and Henderson's *Feast of Bricriu*.

and Celtic parallels from Roman history, e.g. the exploits of Torquatus, Corvus<sup>3</sup> and others: instances of similar fights from Irish romances. Comparison of *Iliad* III. 146–243, with an Irish *τοιχοσκοπία* (*Cours de L. C.* v. pp. 80–148).

Classical writers refer to the Celtic custom of taking dogs to fight for their masters in war (Strabo, iv. c. 5, § 2, Appian Celtica, xii.) In Irish literature the ‘war-hound’<sup>4</sup> is a well-known figure: one famous hound, Ailbe, ‘was worth a whole army.’ ‘Dog’ is a very common element in Irish names, e.g. *Cú-roi*, *Cu-chulainn*.<sup>5</sup> The war-hound is quite unknown to Homer. In the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* dogs and birds attack dead men only. Though we have a few Homeric instances of the dog as ‘the friend of man,’ on the whole he is despised by the Greek and Trojan warriors, among whom ‘dog’ is a common term of abuse. The influence of women is a very prominent feature in the Irish epic: Plutarch, *de mul. virt.* vi., refers to a treaty between Hannibal and the Gauls, in which the *wives* of the latter are to decide in questions of dispute.

*Chapter II., La Société.* In Homer and Celtic literature the poets and seers are a class apart from the priests. Their influence was very great, even the sovereign, Agamemnon, had to bow before the decision of Calchas; of the Gaulish seers Diodorus says *πάν τὸ πλῆθος ἔχουσιν ὑπήκοον*. Divination from the flight of birds was common to Greeks and Celts, also from the dying movements of sacrificial victims (in Gaul human), and from dreams. We are not told in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* how to distinguish a true from a false dream; the Irish Celt knew how to do so. The intending dreamer must be a *file* (‘seer,’ *\*ueles*, genit. *\*ueletos*, Welsh *gweled*: the Germ. *Ueleda*, Tac. *Hist.* iv. 61, is borrowed from the Celtic), must sacrifice a red pig, a cat, or a dog, then eat a portion of the victim and offer the rest to the gods: after reciting a spell, then another spell ‘over his two hands,’ he must lie down and fall asleep with his head between his hands. His

<sup>3</sup> An interesting parallel to the story of the crow helping the Roman warrior is found in one of the Welsh Arthurian tales, *Breudwyd Rhonabwy*, in which Owain, a knight of Arthur's company, has a flock of crows which fight for their master on seeing his standard raised. (*Red Book*, vol. i. pp. 153 sqq.).

<sup>4</sup> Irish *ár-chú*, from *ár*, battle, Welsh *aer*, Gaulish *ver-agros*, *ἀγρό*, and *cú* (genitive *con*), *κύων*.

<sup>5</sup> ‘Smith's dog,’ the Irish Achilles, who got this name after having killed a fierce dog belonging to a smith; probably a trace of the Heracles-Cerberus legend.

dreams will be true ones. Among the Romans and Greeks (not Homeric) the process was less complicated: the would-be seer had only to sleep on the skins<sup>1</sup> of the victims in the temple or sacred wood of the god who was to send the dream. (Vergil, *Aen.* vii. 81-101.)

The Druids, a class distinct from the bard and seer (Strabo, iv. c. 5 § 4), differ from the Homeric *ἱερεῖς* in that they form a close corporation and are not attached to any temple or to the service of any particular deity: their position is higher than that of the *ἱερεῖς* since the presence of a Druid was essential to the validity of every sacrifice. The Druids belonged to the aristocracy, the seers and poets to the Celtic bourgeoisie. This middle class, intermediate between the noble and common plebeian, consisted of the professional soldier; the seer (Hom. *μάντις*): the carpenter, smith, and worker in bronze (*τέκτων*): the harpist, poet, historian (*δοιδός*): the doctor (*ἰατρίη*), and the cup-bearer (who takes the place of Hom. *κύπερξ*). The chief difference between the Celtic and Homeric list (*Od.* xvii. 383) is that the former contains the professional soldier, who does not seem to have existed in Homeric times: but we have instances of Greeks serving as mercenaries (the 10,000) some time before the earliest recorded instance of Celtic mercenaries (369 B.C. in Egypt). So Mommsen is not justified in calling the Celts 'die rechten *Lanzknechte* des alterthums' *R.G.* i. 8th ed. p. 326. Here the French critic reminds the learned historian of the German origin of the French *lansquenets*. A wrong explanation of *γαλαρατοι* is given by Polybius, ii. 22, it simply means *lance-bearers* (Irish *gae*, spear; *Sanscr.* *hēsas*; *χαῖος*). Both Greeks and Celts omit the merchant from their list, and to both 'pirate' implies no dishonour.

*Chapter III. La Religion.* A characteristic feature of the early Celtic character is faith in the power of the magician. For the Celtic magician a simple incantation is sufficient to call up the dead; the Homeric hero must go through a far more complicated process. The teaching of the Druids. The anthropomorphism of the Greek and Celt had been preceded by a period of nature-worship: the Irish king Conchobar swears by heaven, earth, and water; so Hera *II.*

<sup>1</sup> Traces of a similar custom may be seen in the Welsh *Breudwyf Rhonabwy* (Red Book, i. p. 146), where it is the man who falls asleep on the skin of a yellow calf who sees the wonderful visions that give their name to the tale, *Rhonabwy's Dream*; cf. *Lady of the Lake*, Canto IV.

xv. 36-38. Relations of gods and men, mortals of divine parentage<sup>2</sup>; cf. *Ἀπολλογένης*, *Ἑρμογένης*, *Κηφισογένης* with Gaul. *Camulogenos* (son of Camulos the Gaulish Mars): acc. to Propertius, v. 10, 41, Virdomarus 'genus hic *Rheno* iactabat ab ipso.'<sup>3</sup> Gods in the form of birds, cf. Athene as swallow with the Irish war goddess Bodb (raven). The home of the gods. There are two self-contradictory conceptions in Homer (1) *Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες*, *II.* i. 18, (2) *οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσιν*, *II.* xx. 299. Of these the second is the oldest. The Irish gods came originally from the sky, and dwelt in Ireland until they were conquered by men, then some left the country and occupied the distant islands of the west,<sup>4</sup> others remained hidden in the caves of the land.

The Celts do not seem to have been acquainted with the idea of the dead being received in Heaven above or Hades below: they are always sent to the far-off corners of the world (Elysium). When a man dies his life or soul passes into the world of the dead, and there finds a copy of all that is laid in the tomb or burnt on the pyre. This doctrine was carried to its logical conclusion by the Celt, and even letters<sup>5</sup> could be sent to the deceased by burning the writing on the tomb, and debts<sup>6</sup> could be paid in the next world. The Greek conception of the after-life as we have it in Homer is a mixture of contradictory notions; this inconsistency is due to the introduction of foreign ideas borrowed from the Semites, especially the Homeric Hades, that sad and dark country in which the dead are mere shades or phantoms, and not living bodies as in the Celtic or Sanscrit myth. The

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Achilles, son of a goddess, and his Celtic counter-type Cuchullin, son of the god Lug. There is a very striking resemblance between these two favourite heroes: both excel in bravery, the life of both is brilliant but cut off before its prime. The horse of Achilles possesses the gift of speech, can divine the future, and sheds tears over his master's fate: the horse of Cuchullin foresees coming events, and sheds tears of blood.

<sup>3</sup> There is no need, adds our author, for modern editors to change *Rheno* into *Brenno*, as we know from inscriptions that the Rhine was worshipped, and a tradition existed that the Rhine was father to a mortal son by a mortal woman; Propertius' authority may have been Fabius Pictor, the contemporary of Virdomarus.

<sup>4</sup> The Homeric Elysium. Mortals have also reached this happy land, as Bran mac Febal who, in the Irish legend, met on his way the sea-god Manannan mac Lir travelling in a chariot which gently rolled over the crest of the waves. See the *Voyage of Bran* (Nutt), edited and translated by Kuno Meyer with essay on the 'Happy Other-world,' by Alfred Nutt.

<sup>5</sup> *Diod.* v. 28.

<sup>6</sup> *Mela*, iii. c. 2, § 19.

Celt buries his dead, the Homeric Greek is cremated. Of a belief in reward or punishment after death there is no trace in Celtic theology. Lucky and unlucky numbers—To the Greek and Celt the right was the lucky side, to the Roman the left, owing to Etruscan influence.

*Chapter IV. La Famille.* The Celtic like the Homeric family is based on the monogamic principle.

*Chapter V. La Guerre.* The war-chariot of the Gauls excited considerable comment among the Romans. Among the earliest Gauls and Irish known to us, horsemanship in battle was exceptional; in later times the use of the chariot in war was abandoned.

There is a difference in form between the Celtic and Greek war-chariot, the Homeric warrior has to remain standing, while there is a seat for two in the Celtic chariot in which the warrior sits on the left, the driver on the right. *Essedum* is really the name of the seat alone (= *ex-sedon* 'siège extérieur, siège hors de la maison'); [but Stokes is more probably correct, in resolving it into *en-sedon*, of *in-sideon*].

Arms of the Celt: defensive, shield: offensive, stones<sup>1</sup> (with or without the use of a sling), spear, sword and club. The other defensive weapons attributed to the Celts by various authorities are of later origin and borrowed from strangers. The use of the bow and arrow was quite unknown to the old Irish and British; the Irish *saiged* and Welsh *saeth* are borrowed from *sagitta*, their word for bow, (Ir. *boga*, W. *bwa*) is of Germanic origin.

The arms of the Celt are very similar to those of the warriors of Homer, but there is no similarity whatever in their names, while there is a very close resemblance in the names used by the Romans, Germans, and Celts: for instance, none of the numerous Homeric words for 'lance' occur in Celtic: Gaul: *gaison*, (Ir. *gae*) = Germ: *ger*; Ir. *sciath* (shield) = *scutum* which can hardly be connected with *σκήτρος* as this is never used by Homer to mean 'the leather of a shield' (*ῥινός*) but always in the sense of 'shoe leather' (*Od.* xiv. 34): the Gaulish *cladebos* (Ir. *claideb*) borrowed by the Romans became *gladius*; G. *carros*, (chariot) = *currus*, Ir: *roth* (wheel) = *rota*, and Germ *rad*; this word occurs in the river-name Rotanos changed by the Greeks

of Massilia into Rhodanos owing to the influence of the Homeric line

παρ ποταμὸν κελάδοντα, παρὰ ῥοδανὸν δονακτῆ.  
Il. xviii. 576.

The use of military ensigns (heads of animals) is common to the Celts and Romans.

T. HUDSON WILLIAMS.

University College of N. Wales,  
Bangor.

## MONTHLY RECORD.

### AUSTRIA.

*Haimburg (Carnuntum).*—During the uncovering of the *porta principalis sinistra* of the Roman camp a magazine for weapons and stores was brought to light, in perfect preservation. It contained an enormous number of Roman weapons, 1,037 in all, including fragments of *loricae segmentatae*; among the stores were various kinds of grain. Some important inscriptions were found, which have not as yet been studied. The porta appears to belong to two different periods. The water-supply of the camp was found to be provided by three conduits, in one of which was found a marble torso of Dionysos, of good style.<sup>1</sup>

### ITALY.

*Acqui, Piedmont.*—A mosaic pavement has been found with an inscription in black tessellae, which runs: L'VLATIVS P'F'L'VALERIVS IV'VIRI AED' POT | D'D'CAMERAS PAVIMENTA TECTA A'RESTITVE RVNT (or FECERVNT) | L'VALERIVS M'F'CV[RA]TOR PRO[B]AVIT. The use of tessellae and omission of the *Cognomina* seem to point to the beginning of the Empire as the date. The Gentile names were already known in the district. This edifice, constructed or repaired by the *quattuorviri aedilicia potestate* at the order of the Municipal Council (*decuriones*) of Aquae Statiellae, seems to be the baths (as indicated by the pavement). The baths of Aquae had some fame in antiquity, and are mentioned by Pliny.<sup>2</sup>

*Teramo (Picenum).*—An inscription to Septimius Severus as *divus* has come to light, set up by the *decuriones* of Interamnia in A.D. 212, a year after his death; the date is given by the fifteenth tribunate and fourth consul-designateship of Caracalla. It is the first inscription from this site with any record of an Emperor, and its object was probably not so much to honour Septimius as to flatter Caracalla.<sup>3</sup>

*Fabriano, Umbria.*—Near the new railway station a series of early Italian tombs, of about the seventh century B.C., has been excavated. Among the contents may be mentioned: (1) two flat semi-cylindrical bronze objects, apparently part of a chariot, and used for fastening the yoke (cf. *Mon. Antich.* iv. p. 472, No. 44); (2) a hooked iron object, the lower part of which is flat; it appears to have served as a step attached near the wheel of the chariot for mounting (cf. representations of mounting chariots in motion, *Bull. Comm. Arch.* 1888, p. 10); (3) three moulded bronze tubes for keeping the reins of a chariot from becoming entangled, and part of a chariot pole; (4) bronze situlae and other vases.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sometimes a hard bullet made of lime and the brain of a fallen enemy was used; cf. *Cours de L. C.* v. 366-373.

<sup>2</sup> *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 9 June.

<sup>3</sup> *Notizie degli Scavi*, Nov. 1899.

<sup>3</sup> *Notizie degli Scavi*, Oct. 1899.



Rome.—Remains of a well-preserved classical building have been found in the Corso Vittorio Emanuele, consisting of two sides of a peristyle, with the columns *in situ*, and a pavement inlaid with breccia; in the intercolumniations are parapets with mural paintings, representing chariot-races, a party in a boat, &c. On the south wing is a fountain with supports in the form of *trapezophoroi*, and a wash-stand adjoining with places for soap, &c. A well-preserved bust of Faustina the Elder was also found.<sup>4</sup>

On the steps leading from the street to the Basilica Aemilia is the base of a round monument (date of early Empire) supporting a round parapet like a tribunal, with an entrance sideways from the street, flanked by pilasters. No explanation has yet been given, but it cannot be the Puteal Libonis, as there are traces of footsteps inside.<sup>4</sup>

Three recently-found inscriptions call for comment. One is a base with dedication by Maxentius, *Marti invicto patri et aeternae urbis suae conditoribus*; on the right side of the base is: *dedicata die XI. Kal. Maias per Furium Octavianum V. C. cur. aed. sacr.* The year is A.D. 308, and the day (21 April) was the 'birthday' of Rome. The base itself is a palimpsest, and had been inscribed all over with the names of *magistri* and other members of the college of *fabri tignarii*; those on the left side still remain, and at the back is the date (1 August, A.D. 154). Probably the base supported a statue of Antoninus Pius given by that guild. Another recently-found inscription has the name of C. Vibius Pansa, the consul of B.C. 43.<sup>2</sup>

The third inscription is only fragmentary. It was found near the Regia, and relates to the *fasti* of the augurs, recording the cooptation of C. Marcius Rutilus in B.C. 290, and of C. Mamilius Turrinus in B.C. 206; the former was consul in 270, the latter in 239. A *sacerdos exauguratus* is mentioned, of whose name only LENTVLVS COS remains; probably the L. Lentulus Caudinus who was consul in 275.<sup>3</sup>

Pompeii.—At Scafati remains of an ancient villa have come to light, containing the following objects: A silver statuette of Isis-Fortuna with steering-ear, situla, ears of corn, and Egyptian head-dress; another of Aphrodite Anadyomene with dove; a rearing serpent in silver; a bronze bull and candelabrum, and a male beardless bust.<sup>3</sup>

Some interesting finds have also been made in Nov.-Dec., 1899. (1) A bronze head of Paris, the eyes inlaid; (2) a small terminal figure of youthful Satyr; (3) a lamp-stand in the form of a torch; (4) three feet of a table ending above in a dog's head and below in a dog's foot; (5) a Pan's pipe with eleven tubes, decorated on the side with shrines in relief (cf. *Bull. dell' Inst.* 1877, p. 99); (6) a large terra-cotta lamp for two wicks with head of Zeus (?) to left, and a horse's head projecting on either side; a bust of a beardless man in stucco, which had perhaps served as a model for a bronze; (8) In December: a painting representing Fortuna, in red, green, and purple on a red ground, and a bronze statuette representing an actor in the *phalakes* with mask and hooded cloak.<sup>5</sup>

Taranto.—A find of 63 new silver coins has been made, seven of Metapontum, one of Velia, the rest of Tarentum; all seem to fall into Evans' Seventh Period (see *Horsemen of Tarentum*), five Tarentine didrachms being anterior to the time of Pyrrhus, and three drachmae either belonging to his hegemony or slightly earlier (according to Evans, *ibid.* p. 126).<sup>3</sup>

## SICILY.

Ragusa (Hybla Heraea).—Dr. Orsi continued his excavations in 1898, and found in one tomb a vase of the kind discussed by Pernice (*Jahrb. d. arch. Inst.* 1899, p. 67 fl.), of Ionic fabric, perhaps used for incense; also a silver fibula of Greek type with long sheath at the foot; in another part of a large Sphinx, the muzzle of a horse, and the hind-quarters of another animal, all in limestone and archaic, perhaps ex-votos. He also found two inscriptions in the Syracuse alphabet, belonging to the end of the sixth century B.C.; both are quite fragmentary.<sup>2</sup>

Buscemi, near Syracuse.—A series of grottoes have been discovered with Greek inscriptions set in architectural frames. One is dated *ἐπὶ ἀμφιπόλου τῶν παιδῶν καὶ τῆς ἀνάσσης* . . . this ἀμφιπόλος being a sacerdotal dignity at Syracuse and Centuripe (Kaibel, *Inscr. Sicil.* 9, 574; *Diod. Sic.* xvi. 70). The *παῖδες* are perhaps Demeter and Kore, *ἀνάσσα* the oriental Artemis (Περσική or Ἀναΐτις).<sup>2</sup>

## GREECE.

Corinth.—Among the finds in the recent excavations are various sculptures of the Roman period. They include a large base for a statue with reliefs on one side representing the return of a young warrior with a trophy. A colossal statue, about twelve feet high, of a youth in a Phrygian cap may belong to this base, as a similar statue was found with its base adorned with similar reliefs. Here the victorious youth is crowned by Victory. Two bronze snakes intertwined may also be mentioned, probably from a head of Medusa.<sup>6</sup>

Volo.—Ten more early graves have been investigated. One contained nine Mycenaean vases and two gold rings; another, a necklace, two silver-plated armlets, and three rings. The corpses were placed in contracted attitudes, resting on the left arm; this attitude is characteristic of early graves in the Cyclades, and has not hitherto been associated with Mycenaean tombs. The graves were lined with slabs of white schist.<sup>6</sup>

Chrysorizita, Aetolia.—A find has been made of over 200 terracotta figures, at least half of which are of a good period. They mostly represent women carrying pitchers, similar to those recently found at Thermon. Among some hundred vases found, only one painted lekythos calls for mention.<sup>6</sup>

## CRETE.

Gnosos.—Mr. Arthur Evans claims, as the result of his recent explorations, to have discovered the palace of the Mycenaean Kings. There were at any rate no remains of a later date. The Royal bathroom, with its central throne is very remarkable, as are the various fresco paintings and stone carvings. In several of the chambers a number of clay tablets were found, analogous to the cuneiform tablets of Babylonia, but with long inscriptions in the 'Mycenaean' script. They had been preserved in clay or wooden coffers, but were mostly broken, as the result of a conflagration. Many of the signs are ideographic, others are clearly numerals, and there is an obvious repetition of certain formulae. They seem likely to refer to the palace accounts and stores, *e.g.*, all in one chamber have figures of shields, chariots, horses' heads, &c., referring to the arsenal; others have ships, houses, vases, &c. Some of the clay seals of the coffers remain, signed and countersigned with devices from this script. It was evidently a highly-

<sup>4</sup> *Athenaeum*, 12 May.

<sup>5</sup> *Notizie degli Scavi*, Dec. 1899.

<sup>6</sup> *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 2 June.



developed system of writing, but quite independent of other contemporaneous civilisations.<sup>7</sup>

## ASIA MINOR.

*Ephesus.*—The theatre may now be said to be completely investigated (cf. *C. R.* for May, p. 188), after three seasons' exploration. The oldest foundations go back to the time of Lysimachus, and the arrangements prove to have been quite in accordance with Dr. Dorpfeld's ideas. The first alteration took place in post-Augustan times; a marble front was erected by Claudius; and later the whole was transformed according to the Roman type. There were further alterations and additions under Domitian. The marble gateway on the way to the harbour proves to be a very interesting example of the transition from the Propylæa type to that of the Roman triumphal arch.<sup>8</sup>

*Miletus.*—In the autumn of 1899 excavations were made on the south side of the city, where there are traces of the road to Didyma. The neighbouring roads have been followed up, and also the course of the walls, which belong to the Hellenistic period. At one point are a massive tower and staircase. The theatre has also been laid bare, with a rectangular courtyard adjoining it, the west wall of which forms the *skene*-wall of the theatre; it is surrounded by chambers, and there are remains of an altar in one place; in the west wall are five doors. The theatre was found full of architectural remains, including an architrave with the name of C. Julius Menecrates. It seems to have been used later as a *Bouleuterion*, to judge by the remains of a mosaic pavement above the marble paving. Near the altar were found two sets of reliefs, one with mythological scenes, the other with representations of arms and armour. Among 191 inscriptions, ranging from the sixth century B.C. to the fifth of our era, one has reference to a dispute between Miletus and Myus, decided by the Satrap of Ionia in favour of the former; its date is about 390 B.C.<sup>8</sup>

## EGYPT.

*Fayum.*—Since the beginning of this year Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt have found numerous fragments of Greek papyri (over 200) at Umm-el-Baraqui, the ancient Tebtunis. In a Roman cemetery they unearthed some portrait heads, painted on wood like the one from Hawara, now in the Brit. Mus. One has on the back a sketch for the portrait in front; on the back of another are memoranda for the painter, with a description of the deceased's features.<sup>4</sup>

H. B. WALTERS.

*Numismatische Zeitschrift* (Vienna). Jan.—June, 1899.

O. Voetter. 'Die Kupferprägungen der Diocletianischen Tetrarchie.' Pp. 1–34, with tables and 3 plates.—H. Willers. 'Nochmals die Silberbarren nebst COMOB.'

In the *Rivista italiana di Numismatica* (Milan), part I., for 1900 Bahrfeldt concludes his monograph on the Romano-Campanian coinage begun in the volume for 1899. P. Orsi describes two finds made in Sicily in 1899:—i. at Syracuse, consisting of coins of Hiero II., Philistis, Hieronymus, 'Alexander the Great' (3rd cent. B.C.) and Antigonus Gonatas. ii. at Licata, Carthaginian silver coins B.C. 241–218.

*Revue numismatique.* Part I, 1900.

E. Babelon. 'Le faux prophète Alexandre d'Abonotichos.' A descriptive list of the coins of

Abonotichos with comments on those referring to Alexander. The general trustworthiness of Lucian's deeply interesting biography of Alexander is confirmed (i) by the appearance, under Antoninus Pius, of the serpent ΓΑΥΚΩΝ (sometimes with a human head) on several coins, and (ii) the change of the town-name by Alexander on the authorization of Marcus Aurelius is borne out by the appearance under Aurelius of the inscription ΙΩΝΟΠΟΛΙΤΩΝ in place of the earlier ΑΒΩΝΟΤΕΙΧΕΙΤΩΝ. Babelon thinks that the town was thus renamed in honour of 'Ιώ or 'Ιώη = 'Ιαώ, the god who appears on various Gnostic gems and who was at Abonotichos probably identified with Glycon. Alexander died in 161, but the serpent is still found on the latest coins of the town, A.D. 253. Ionopolis was existing in the 5th century and the name survives in the modern *İnebolu*.—A. Dieudonné. 'Médailles de bronze de la Lydie.' Two coins stated to have been found in the Holy Land (near Nazareth)—a rather curious *provenance*.—J. Rouvier. 'Le monnayage Alexandrin d'Arados.'—*Review.* Hill's 'Handbook of Greek and Roman coins.'

*Numismatic Chronicle.* Part I, 1900.

W. Wroth. 'Greek coins acquired by the British Museum in 1899' (with two plates). The number of Greek coins acquired by the Museum since 1887 is 6,606, last year's total being 485. The following specimens may be specially noticed:—No. 1. A silver coin of *Etruria*, circ. B.C. 450, with the type of a sepiæ, the body of which is represented by an amphora and the lateral fins by the lower part of two helmets placed sideways. Such a bizarre combination is probably without parallel on autonomous Greek coins. No. 2. *Mesma* (Bruttium). A very beautiful bronze coin with the head of the fountain-nymph Medma (Mesma) (cp. Strab. vi. p. 256). *Reverse*, River-God. No. 7. A gold stater of *Antigonos*, B.C. 306–311, with the types of Alexander the Great, though the Nike holds an acrostolium instead of the usual wreath, perhaps in commemoration of the battle of Salamis (Cyprus) in B.C. 306 when Demetrius Poliorcetes, the son of Antigonus, defeated Ptolemy. No. 10. An unpublished Thesalian coin, probably of *Rhizus*. Nos. 14, 15. Imperial coins of *Aegium* in Achaia illustrating Paus. vii, 23, 5 (temple of Eleithyia) and vii, 23, 7 (Damophon's group of Asklepios and Hygieia). No. 19. A very rare silver coin of *Delos*, circ. B.C. 480. Obv. Lyre. Rev. Wheel. No. 21. One of the tetradrachms of *Lampsacus* struck, circ. B.C. 190, with a fine head of Priapus. No. 22. Coin of *Magydus* in Pamphylia. A list is given of the remarkable numerals occurring at Magydus from Domitian to Salonina. No. 33. A new coin of *Herod Philip II.*, the tetrarch, with the title ΚΤΙC(rov).—H. A. Grueber. 'Find of Roman coins and gold rings at Sully near Cardiff.' An interesting find (made in Oct. 1899 on the Sully Moors) of 4 gold rings and over 300 coins, mostly of silver. The silver coins (except one of Carausius) are of the period A.D. 180–267; the few gold coins are of B.C. 286–306. There is a unique double-aureus of Diocletian and a denarius of Carausius with the legend EXPECTATE VENI. The letters NSR in the exergue of this denarius should, on the analogy of other coins of Carausius, indicate the place of mintage. Grueber suggests *Rutupinae stativa* (or *statio*) *Romana*, i.e. Richborough in Kent, an ingenious but not entirely satisfactory interpretation.

WARWICK WROTH.

<sup>7</sup> *Athenaeum*, 19 May.

<sup>8</sup> *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 28 April.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

**Revue de Philologie.** Vol. 24. Part 2. April, 1900.

*Domitius Marsus sur Bavius et son frère*, L. Havet. Proposes a restoration of the Epigram of Domitius quoted by Philargyrius on Verg. Ecl. iii. 90. *Cicéron* Epist. ix. 16, 3, M. Bonnet. For *si id possem* proposes *si iam possem*. *Orphica*, frag. 3 Abel, P. Tannery. Protests against the alteration of *ἀρβηλα* to *ἀρβηρα* and explains the former. *Notes sur le texte des Institutions de Cassiodore d'après divers manuscrits*, V. Mortet. *Les Cyranides*, F. de Mély. Harpocration of Alexandria received between 350 and 360 A.D., a treatise on oriental magic from the hands of a priest of Alexandria—whether in Egypt or Chaldaea. Harpocration then transformed it into a gnostic book, letting the name of Cyranus appear in the passages borrowed from the original treatise. Then some plagiarist made further alterations, and the new book was attributed to Hermes Trismegistus. *Horace*, ép. ii. 1. 102, A. d'Alès. Explains this line by the preceding and not, as is usually done, by vv. 93, 94, and thus translates 101, 102. 'Quelle sympathie ou quelle aversion est à l'abri de l'inconstance humaine? Tout fatigue à la longue: même les douceurs de la paix, même les vents favorables.' *Le décret de Callias, comment les Athéniens ont éteint leur dette après la guerre archidamique*, E. Cavaignac. Following Beloch the writer recurs to the opinion of Boeckh, and maintains that this decree was engraved during the peace of Nicias and refers to that period, and not to a period fifteen or twenty years earlier as Kirchhoff had thought. *Sur le nom d'un protecteur de Phèdre et sur le nom de Phèdre lui-même*, L. Havet. In the epilogue to book iii. reads in l. 2 *Primum, Eutyche, ne videar <libi> molestior* Eutyche being voc. of Eutyches. The poet may also have been called *Phæder* not *Phædrus*. *Paulinus Nolanus obitus Baebiani*, L. Havet. A restoration of some of these lines. *Euripide*, Alceste 1-85, M. L. Earle. Maintains the authenticity of 24-76 on the ground that ll. 1-85 (except l. 16) form a whole. *Cicero de domo* § 76, P. Graindor. For *emendanda* of codd. which has been variously altered proposes *emercanda*. *Cicero de domo*, D. Serruys. Notes on several passages. *Plautus*, Rudens, D. Serruys. On ll. 1200, 1068-69, 1246-48, 137.

**Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik.** vol. xi. Part 4. 1900.

*Über der Sprachgebrauch der Kaiserkonstitutionen im Codex Justinianus*, H. Krüger. *Von dem sog. Genetivus und Ablativus qualitatis* II., Edwards-Wölflin. The exx. in Latin literature beginning from Plautus—99 in number—are quoted and discussed where both cases are found in the same sentence. The abl. is one of attendant circumstances (=with), the gen. of an abiding property (=of), but this distinction cannot always be maintained. *Quodie*, L. Havet. This word is sometimes found as an adverb, the antecedent being of fem. gender, e.g. *Cic. de domo* § 45 *prodicta die quodie* etc. *Ne* und *num* F. Glockner. *Ne* is derived not from the negative *nē* but from the affirmative *nē*. As *cum* has a temporal, a causal-conditional, and a modal sense, so in the interrogative *num* we must distinguish between the temporal, the consecutive-conclusive, and modal use of the word. Examples of each are given. *Vas* plural *vases*, E. Nestle. Maintains that in Eccli. (Sirach) 6, 30 cod.

Amiatinus is right in reading *vases* virtutis where editors read *bases*. *Hexameter und Silberne Prosa*, E. Wölflin. The effect of the admiration for the Augustan poets even in their lifetime was such that poetical turns found their way into prose, and silver Latin made hardly any distinction between the diction of prose and poetry, against which Quintilian protests. *Funerare in der Epitoma Livii*, E. Wölflin. Valerius Maximus takes this word from the Epitoma of Livy. It is a poetical word first found in Horace (Od. iii. 8. 7). *Euphemismus und Verwandeltes*, O. Hey. It is shown how all cases of euphemism come under one of two general divisions, being due to either fear or shame. *Campana Glocke*, *Species Spzerei*, E. Wölflin. *Campana* (from *aes Campanum*) appears first in literature in Bede, though we can trace it back to about 515 A.D. *Glocke* appears in the form *clocca* in Adamnan's Life of Columba about 695. In Gaul before the reception of the word *Glocke* we find *signum*. We find *species* in the sense of all kinds of small articles of traffic, Nonius has *merx est species ipsa*, and the word afterwards became specialised in meaning. *Die tractatus Origenis de libris SS. scripturarum ein Werk Novatians*, C. Weyman. This tractate, assigned to Origen by Magr. Batiffol, is here ascribed to Novatian chiefly on linguistic grounds. *Aleari*, L. Havet. It is suggested that this verb occurs *Ter. Ad. 33* where *aut te aleari* is proposed for *aut te amari*.

MISCELLLEN. *Multo tanta plus, bis tanta plus*, L. Havet. Considers that in several passages in Plautus (e.g. Rud. 521, Stich 339, Bacch. 310) we should read *tanta* for *tanto*, so in Cic. Verr. 3, 225. *Em bei Plautus und Terenz*, B. Maurenbrecher. Against Stowasser's conjecture, supported by Skutsch, that *em* is from the imper. *eme* by syncope. *Promulsis*, F. Skutsch. Maintains that the penultimate in the oblique cases is short. *Turdus=turgidus*, O. Plasberg. *El-mentum*, J. Cserép. Suggests the derivation from Hebrew *clam* through the Greek *ἐλάμωρα*. *Zur Etymologie von donec und secus*, A. Zimmermann. Planta's supposition of a negative *ne* in *donecum* not to be maintained. *Secus=secundus*, the adjectival use of *secus* is old.

**Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie.** 1900.

23 May. Euripides, *Iphigenia auf Tauris*, von S. Reiter (K. Busche), unfavourable. C. Rüger. *Oratio de corona navali num a Demosthene scripta sit, inquiritur* (G. Hüttner), favourable. O. Müller. *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des attischen Bürger- und Ehre rechts* (S. Szanto), very favourable. G. Pescatori. *Tabulae aeneae o tabulae roboreae* (W. Soltan), on the twelve tables. J. Zingler. *De Cicerone historico quaestiones* (W. Soltan), favourable. J. Raeder. *De Theodoretii Graecarum affectionum curatione quaestiones criticae* (J. Dräseke), very favourable.

30 May. F. Schömann. *Griechische Allertümer*. 4. A. von J. H. Lipsius. I. *Das Staatswesen* (O. Schulthess). 'No better book on the subject to be recommended.' A. S. Arvanitopulo. *Questioni di diritto attico* (O. Schulthess). 'Contains no new results.' L. Annaei Senecae, *De beneficiis libri vii. de clementia libri ii.*, rec. C. Hosius (W. Gemoll). 'A learned and intelligent work.' H. Menge. *Repetitorium der lateinischen Syntax und Stilistik*. 7. A. (C. Stegmann), favourable.



